THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE

DANIEL DORCHESTER, JR.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 9 1919
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division HN64
Section .D69

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 9 1919
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE

BY
DANIEL DORCHESTER, JR.

A kingdom of ends in which all are sovereigns and all are subjects.—*Kant.*

New York: EATON & MAINS
Cincinnati: JENNINGS & GRAHAM

Copyright, 1914, by
DANIEL DORCHESTER

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Sovereign People	5
II.	Some Old Oppressions	28
III.	The Shackles of Plutocracy	45
IV.	The Industrial Struggle	71
V.	Rent, the Modern Fate	102
VI.	The New Socialism	126
VII.	How Germany is Solving Some of Our Social Problems	144
VIII.	Christian Paganism	165
IX.	Wealth and Welfare	186
X.	The Church and Her Critics	205
XI.	The Churches and Christ's Kingdom	223

CHAPTER I

THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE

The New is Old,
The Old is New.
The cycle of a change sublime
Still sweeping through.

NOTHING is newer or older than human society; nothing is passing through such sweeping, sublime changes. It looks backward through the centuries to the common instincts and aspirations which gave it birth and forward to the ever-progressing ideals, projected by the human soul from within and flashed upon it from without, which urge mankind to higher and holier attainments.

Men and women in every age and condition come from a common stock and are travelers on the mysterious journey from the cradle to the grave. The same elemental attractions bind them together into families and races. The beliefs that lie deepest and survive the longest are common to all. The literature

that is greatest and living is confined to no race, class, or condition. Laws, originally, were made by common instincts or experience and enforced by common consent. United action of the whole for each individual and of each individual for the whole grew out of the necessities of primitive life: upon the complete devotion of each man to his tribe hung his fate as well as that of his tribe. The first legislation was "the law of the jungle." Kipling describes it in his forceful way:

Now this is the law of the jungle—as old and as true as the sky;
And the wolf that shall keep it may prosper, but the wolf that shall break it must die.
As the creeper that girdles the tree front, the law runneth forward and back—
For the strength of the pack is the wolf, and the strength of the wolf is the pack.
Now these are the laws of the jungle and many and mighty are they;
But the head and the hoof of the law, and the haunch and the hump is obey.

In the jungle and in the highly civilized state alike, the validity of this primitive rule is evident—law exists for the benefit

of society and must be obeyed, because obedience insures public welfare. The slackening of obedience and discipline brought disaster to the savage tribe, and it just as truly breaks down the "unity and married calm of states."

What unites men is essential rather than what separates them; union is deeper than all division. When Mr. Gladstone was making one of his speeches to extend the franchise to English workmen he exclaimed, "After all, they are our own flesh and blood!" This utterance is the central idea of democracy and its effective slogan. When humanity comes to itself it repudiates the artificial and accidental distinctions which estrange men, and it recognizes that in the love of a common Father there is "no respect of persons"; all stand heart to heart in an essential equality.

Society, in all its groups, governments, and activities, should be like the sea—broad, deep, and so free in all its parts that every drop at the bottom may rise through all its waters to bask in the sunshine on the crest of the highest wave. But society for long ages was much like

the ocean, as Browning, in his "Paracelsus," describes it:

Waiting in its bed till some one wave
Out of the multitudinous mass
Extends the empire of the whole—thenceforth the rest,
E'en to the meanest, hurry in at once
To swell the advancing tide.

There have been long periods when society, like the ocean on a calm day, seemed stationary; progress was confined to certain favored classes. But out of the depths of human yearnings and needs there has flowed a mighty gulf current, which has been steadily broadening and deepening, until to-day its flood of gathering waters is sweeping along every people and changing the political and moral climate of every country.

This gulf current in the ocean of humanity is democracy, though this term by no means comprehends or expresses the full significance of this current. It is religious and social as well as political, and as such is the mightiest movement in human affairs to-day, not only in the United States, but in every civilized coun-

try on the face of the earth. The divine right of kings has already become a vanishing tradition, and all forms of exploitation of the many by the few are beginning to give way before the ever-increasing, insistent demand that whatever most vitally concerns humanity as a whole must be intrusted to the collective sagacity of the people. The social discontent which has for centuries been heaving in humanity like an angry sea is now at its flood and determined to make the most of its opportunity and power. Through all the mingled right and wrong of human striving, through all the rise and fall of nations and parties, there is a steady convergence of factors and forces. "A kingdom of ends," to use Kant's phrase, "in which all are sovereigns and all are subjects," is steadily rising in power, and man, irrespective of race, status, or condition, is becoming increasingly recognized. The domination of caste and the submergence of the silent, exploited peoples are passing. These three sovereignties, "the sovereignty of right over force, the sovereignty of right over prejudice, and

the sovereignty of duty over selfishness," are winning the suffrages of mankind and becoming dominant in human affairs. The widening recognition of common duties and interests is shifting the center of gravity in government and society from the self-aggrandizement of the privileged few to the conservation of the social whole.

A true democracy is not merely a form of government, but the organic manifestation of the people in their collective capacity, and thus invested with a sovereignty and a character distinctly different from the individuals maintaining it. Such writers as Mulford[1] and others contend

[1] The nation is of divine institution and formed in its unity and continuity in a divine relation, and in the realization of relations in humanity, in contrast with a condition in which fear and interest and ill will are the prevailing motives in the combination of men, which is constituted in the confederation of separate interests, and for the pursuance of selfish ends, to subserve only the pleasure or the possession of men. It is the battle borne on through the centuries of a society which is formed in the recognition of a divine vocation, and of a law of righteousness and freedom, with the forces of dissolution. It is the great battle of humanity with all that oppresses and degrades it—the battle of Judæa with Babylon. The one apprehends humanity as it is in the divine image, and its rights and its sacredness which society is to realize; the other assumes in humanity an existence only in physical course of nature and would stamp upon it the image of a Babylonian spirit. The one is the life of the nation, which can only build on the divine foundation; the other would build of its own materials, the brick and mortar which it has gathered, a city which will reach from the earth to the heavens. It is this with which the nation has to contend in every age—the spirit which, confessing only a material bond, will bring men at last to worship only that.—*Mulford*, Nation, pp. 408, 409.

that the nation or the state is a moral organism, with a mind, conscience, and will by which it exercises rule over the very individuals to whom it owes its life. This organism has been compared by the Outlook to the family. The family "is something other than a man and a woman and some children living within four walls and under the roof of a single house. The family has a character of its own, and this character is distinguished from and is more than the character of the individuals who compose the home. It is a composite character. So the American nation is something more than the ninety millions of heterogeneous people who live upon its territory and under its flag. Its public opinion is something other than the sum of their opinions. Their opinions, intermingling, combining, colliding with each other, make a composite opinion different from that of any one, different from that of the sum of them all. The consciences of its various members, combined, produce a moral sentiment different from the moral sentiment of any one or of all taken separately. The wills of

this ninety millions of people strive with one another in a political campaign. In the conflict, each individual will is modified by the wills of the neighbors." (Outlook, October 19, 1912.)

Furthermore, in a democracy, as in every form of government, there is, in addition to its human agents, a divine power and wisdom operative in the souls of the people. It is this divine impulsion, this divine sovereignty and paternity, ever seeking purer and fuller embodiments, through the reason and the conscience of the people, which gives democracy and every government whatever right they have to rule. Apart from this divine life coursing through the body of humanity, no government has any real authority or abiding existence. All laws, all forms of justice and political administration are really subservient to the ever-progressing demands of a better social order, a wiser rule as they become revealed to the growing intelligence and conscience of humanity.

Mr. Kidd, in his very able exposition of the evolutionary process that is molding Western civilization, reverently recog-

nizes as having the greatest potency those religious and moral forces which, while immanent in humanity, always transcend it and seek to subordinate all political theories and parties, all selfish interests of corporations and individuals to an ever-developing, diviner social organism. "The general observer sees the forward movement in politics carrying along with it a thousand interests and a multitude of submovements, the selfish objects of which its direction for the time being happens to favor. But it must never be forgotten that not in the superficial conclusions often drawn from these appearances have we the meaning of Western Liberalism. Deep below the surface of such phenomena, the cause which is carrying development forward has been the expression of a force unparalleled in history; a force which has always represented, in the last resort, a sense of responsibility in men's minds, outweighing the claims of all political interests and a quality of conviction transcending the content of every political creed" (Kidd, Western Civilization, p. 374).

Mr. Kidd very clearly outlines "the

long drawn-out struggle between two opposing forces," which is so conspicuous in our present political and industrial life. "On the one side we have the survival of the Old-World law of an earlier era of evolution, through which every existing dominant force endeavors, in its own interests, to shut down in the present upon the higher potentialities of society in the future. On the other side we have the influence of the fundamental conception inherent in our civilization, which, in gradually projecting the sense of human responsibility outside the limits of all political creeds and interests, is—in economics as already in thought and in politics—slowly breaking and dissolving all the closed imperiums in which the free play of human activities would otherwise tend to be restrained and imprisoned. . . . As in politics the movement has been toward equal political rights, so in economics it is now a movement toward equality of economic opportunity. In the modern world it has already become, says Professor Sidgwick, 'an ethical postulate that the distribution of wealth in a well-ordered

state should aim at realizing political justice.' . . . As Professor Sidgwick points out, the resulting inequality of opportunity cannot in consequence be justified before the common social conscience. It fails to satisfy the current moral consciousness, to an ever-increasing degree, that one party should be in a position to profit not only by inevitable ignorance or distress, but by the actual disability or the enforced disadvantage of the other" (Kidd, Western Liberalism, pp. 379–381).

Democracy, like man, "partly is and wholly hopes to be." What democracy hopes to be, "a kingdom of ends in which all are sovereigns and all are subjects," where all shall share in some just measure in the benefits of advancing civilization, is the sovereignty toward which all peoples move. Democracy at present, like every other form of government, is a "rough second best." The worst as well as the best passions of mankind are continually struggling for supremacy and the divine will diffused in humanity, upon which all salutary governments depend, is only partially manifest. Popular opinion is often,

as Robert Peel declared in 1820, "a great compound of folly, weakness, prejudice, obstinacy, and popular paragraphs." Government by the people has been notoriously, in many instances, government by the cohesive power of public plunder. The voice of the people is not always the voice of God, but a strange jargon of high-sounding pretensions and selfish clamors.

The voice of kings or aristocracies is not always wise and just. The arrogant pretension of the divine right to rule has been associated with every crime known to humanity. For centuries the privileged classes aggrandized themselves, sapped the energies of the people, and stubbornly opposed all measures for the emancipation and betterment of the common people. Gladstone, who began his political career as a Tory, leaves this impressive testimony: "In almost every one, if not in every one, of the greatest political controversies of the last fifty years, whether they affected the franchise, whether they affected commerce, whether they affected religion, whether they affected the bad and abominable institution of

slavery, or what subject they touched, these leisured classes, these educated classes, these titled classes have been in the wrong."

On the contrary, the history of democracy shows that in every great moral crisis, when the issue between right and wrong has been clearly presented and discussed, the clarified residuum in the popular verdict has declared in favor of the right and chosen the men best fitted to enforce the right. The judgment of the people has been proven again and again to be wiser than the judgment of any class, and out of the conflict of popular discussion and election have come more substantial benefits to humanity than have ever been conferred by kings or nobles. The "common sense of most," in which the instincts, the intuitions and altruistic feelings have full play, has been a wiser and safer guide than the conclusions of the so-called educated classes who have been influenced by merely intellectual and selfish motives.[1]

[1] The line of the Presidents, the elect of the people, from President Washington to President Lincoln, has been greater than any line of kings. The moral strength of the people has been tried in its integrity and firmness of resolve, through the crises of the most mighty insurrection, and it has sought the maintenance of the authority of law, and the consistence and continuance of order.—*Mulford*, Nation, p. 225.

John Morley declares that "titular aristocracies postpone the larger interests to the narrow interests of their order." Mr. Brierley, the brilliant English essayist, says that this "sentence is an apt summary of the procedures of our hereditary Chamber. The story is one of stubborn resistance to every endeavor after social and economic betterment. Religious liberty, extension of the franchise, reform of our barbarous criminal law, Factory Acts, Poor Law reform—all these endeavors after justice and humanity have found in the Upper House a giant maul who barred their progress, who maimed where he could not destroy. . . . What, after all, is the use of our present-day aristocracy? . . . Aristocracy is the government, the leadership of the best. But are these people the best? Their ancestors were, according to the standards of the time. They reached their place by their deeds and their qualities. Can their present representatives offer any such credentials? The receiving and spending of rents is hardly in itself an heroic performance. The pursuits and qualifications of a majority of

them are on a level with those of the game-keeper and the jockey."[1]

No individual or class is or can be supreme and wise enough to determine what is for the best good of all. God is the sole Sovereign. His divinity is diffused through humanity, and only by the whole people, guided and controlled by Him, can His rule be established. It should, therefore, be the ultimate aim and endeavor of politics and religion alike to secure the freest and fullest expression of the people's will.

Politics is a moving picture of the people as they appear at a certain point of time. Their characteristics and tendencies, their grandeurs and miseries, their aspirations and groveling impulses are faithfully depicted. Old forces which have dominated the stage for a period are seen passing off and new forces, flushed with expectation, rush into the arena. There is often such a swirl of provincial passions and interests that the main issue and the real meaning of it all are obscured. Political campaigns, with all their foam and

[1] *Brierley*, Life and the Ideal, pp. 116, 117.

fury, are ephemeral things. Parties come and go like the waves of the sea, but there is a mighty tide sweeping through all peoples and all popular movements which, in spite of opposing and transverse currents, is steadily bearing humanity forward. God is supreme. He is always in power, though frequently politicians and parties are on these changing, earthly thrones. Sometimes God apparently suffers defeat, and his cause seems to go backward. But after every ebb tide there comes "flooding in the main"; and God's will is more perfectly done in terms of human life.

In all countries and in all times may be discovered these two classes of people, conservatives and progressives. These distinctions are imbedded in human nature. Bryce says that "the essence of English parties has lain in the existence of two sets of views and tendencies which divide the nation into two sections; the party, let us say—though these general terms are not very safe—of movement and the party of standing still; the party of liberty and the party of order." What

Bryce says of the political parties in England is true also of the political parties here in America. Ever since that constitutional convention held in Philadelphia in 1787, there have been two clearly defined tendencies in our political life: there have been those who have contended for stability, for authority in government, in a word, for conservatism in administration of public affairs, and there have been those who have contended for new and larger extensions of the principles of liberty to human needs.

These two distinctions, conservative and progressive, obviously do not conform to the lines of cleavage made by political parties in the past or in the present. Political parties and leaders often turn somersaults. The conservative of one day comes up the next day with the smiling face of a progressive, and the progressive settles back into the most stubborn sort of a "standpatter."

The Republican party was a progressive party in the beginning, and it has a splendid record for progress. Many persons, however, think that, like all political parties

when long in power, the Republican party has become too conservative and has been more or less under the dominion of selfish interests, which have used it as they have all parties, to accomplish their own ends. It has those in its ranks who are disposed to let things alone, go slow, and stand pat, but it has put in force some of the very measures for which the Progressives clamor.

Even the Progressive party has conservative elements. In the gravest and best considered speech of his recent campaign, Colonel Roosevelt said: "Friends, do not forget that we are proposing no new principles. The doctrines that we preach reach back to the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount. They reach back to the commandments delivered at Sinai. All that we are doing is to apply those declarations in the shape necessary to make them available for meeting the living issues of our own day. We decline to be bound by the empty little cut-and-dried formulas of by-gone philosophies, useful once, perhaps, but useless now."

The new in government, like the new in religion, art, and industry, which is really salutary and permanent, comes out of the old. There is always a sloughing off of old forms and the infusion of a new, aggressive spirit to give what is essential and vital larger scope and greater efficiency.

Conservatism and progressiveness have each their virtues and their limitations. Both are essential to the welfare of the people. They are like the centripetal and the centrifugal forces of the earth. Reverence for authority and inherited traditions helps hold things in their places. Regard for property and property rights promotes responsibility, makes men thrifty, and is a safeguard against lawlessness. The conservative has a comfortable station in life; he has much to lose and little to gain by any change. Hence he is inclined to be selfish and to ignore the interests of the larger social whole to which he belongs. And when his interests are menaced he often degenerates into a reactionary and blocks the wheels of progress.

But a Power transcending all classes, parties, and even governments is continually at work in the soul of society instilling new ideals and bodying forth in multitudinous forms of economic, moral, and spiritual well-being. Human progress can never be explained apart from this supernatural factor. Eucken, in speaking of the marvelous transformation effected at the beginning of the Christian era, asks: "How came it to pass that this particular point of life was the fountain head of so mighty a movement, that old ideals were shattered and new ones arose, that the whole previous balance of life was upset and previous standards failed to satisfy, that a mighty longing took possession of mankind, a stormy unrest which even now, after hundreds of years, is not allayed? Is not all this a proof that new sources were unsealed, new currents set in motion, that the whole life of a higher order became wonderfully near and intimate, overwhelmingly forceful and penetrating?" (Christianity and the New Idealism, p. 57.)

Similar influxes of divine power have been manifest in all the great formative

periods of human history and never have they been more conspicuous than in the economic and social changes which have accompanied the rise of democracy. In England, early in the last century, men, women, and children were laboring in mines, factories, and fields much as brute beasts labor, and suffering all sorts of barbarities. But the laws of England then existing and the machinery of justice then in power would never have righted those wrongs had it not been for the persistent agitation of Lord Shaftesbury and other friends of humanity, who, with the might of an aroused people behind them, compelled those in power to make those grudging concessions now known as Factory Acts.

Slavery in this country was not abolished by the working out of economic laws, although some wise men saw that slave labor was a very costly way of raising cotton, and that only the traffic in human flesh made it profitable. Slavery would never have been abolished but for the uprising of the people and the election of Abraham Lincoln to carry out

the will of the people, who were wiser and better than the country's laws.

It is true that in the issues immediately before us certain economic laws are the great regulating forces in the commercial world, and that the aim to be sought is the regeneration of business rather than its dismemberment. It is true that government interference often checks enterprise and weakens industrial efficiency. But history tells us most impressively that when wrongs have been righted it has been due not to the operation of natural laws, nor to the ordinary forms of legal procedure, but to some apostolic aggressive personalities who have brought about the necessary legislation.

Carlyle asks: "How, in connection with inevitable democracy, is indispensable sovereignty to be established? This is the question of questions." The sovereignty of the people can be established only as the people become better fitted to obey the divine guidance. The only cure for the evils of democracy is more and better democracy, the organization of the best of all for the welfare of all.

Obedience to divine authority, freedom from blinding passion and prejudice, walking in "the light continually breaking out of the Word of God and human experience, government made conservatively and constructively progressive in safeguarding the rights and promoting the welfare of all the people—this is the realization," "the indispensable sovereignty" for which society travails in pain. The following chapters will endeavor to show how indispensable such sovereignty is to the solution of our social problems.

CHAPTER II

SOME OLD OPPRESSIONS

Once this teeming and fruitful earth, so far as it was occupied by man, was owned in common. Its treasures of land, water, forest, and mine belonged to every human being as truly as the air he breathed. But as population increased and families and tribes multiplied, struggles arose for the exclusive ownership of land and natural resources. Such struggles led to the subjugation of one tribe by another. The conquered were put to death or became slaves and worked for the enrichment of the conquerors. Later, tribes were merged into nations; wars were waged upon a gigantic scale, and whole peoples, white peoples more often than black, were enslaved and condemned to the harder and baser occupations. No matter what their social position previously had been, the enslaved became social outcasts and were forbidden to compete or to associate with those above them. Wars were fre-

quent and the slave market was kept well supplied. Capitalists largely bought their laborers instead of hiring them. Free labor was thus submerged by this abundant supply of slaves.

Slavery was then thought to be in accordance with the divine order and necessary to the development of society. It was contended that human beings are constitutionally divided into the strong and the weak, and that the lower masses ought to serve the higher and superior classes. Aristotle declared that "by nature some command and others obey. He who can do nothing but labor with his body is a slave by nature." In Greece about one seventh of the people devoted themselves to politics, philosophy, and the fine arts, while the other six sevenths slaved to maintain this leisure cultured class in luxury. It was even proposed by Xenophon to raise the national revenue by means of slaves instead of by taxation. "Suppose," he reasons, "that the Athenian state should buy twelve thousand slaves and should let them out to work in the mines at an obolus a head, and suppose

that the whole amount annually thus received should be employed in the purchase of new slaves, who should again in the same way yield the same income, and so on successively; the state would then by these means, in five or six years, possess six thousand slaves, which would yield a large income."

This serious proposal for the successive purchase of slaves out of the profits from the labor of slaves, and this cold-blooded computation of compound interest in such an abominable business, by men whose masterpieces of philosophy, literature, and art we so much admire, seems strange and horrible.

But slavery with its dreadful barbarities has flourished within the memory of men now living. Less than sixty years ago, here in democratic America, slavery was regarded a divine institution and an economic necessity. It will be an ever-increasing wonder that such a colossal, damning wrong should have been intrenched among us so long. And our children will wonder why we allowed certain forms of industrial slavery. There is,

it is true, no longer property in man or in the use of man. No man can now be either inherited or sold in whole or in part. He is his own, and his power of labor is his own. But he is still far from being in full possession of himself or of his labor. He cannot work without materials to work upon and instruments to work with, and for these the modern laborer is dependent on the private owners in whose hands these materials and instruments have accumulated. The consequence is that under existing industrial arrangements the modern laborer has no individual property in his labor. He is obliged to part with the whole value of his labor and in many cases to content himself with little more than a bare subsistence in return.

Slavery, both in ancient and in modern times, crumbled in pieces because it destroyed human beings and debauched society. The slave had no interest in the society which he was compelled to serve nor in the state which kept him in his menial position. There was no chance for him to better himself, or to rise in

the social scale, and there was no lower deep into which to sink. His humanity was outraged and his soul naturally flamed with resentment against his oppressors. Any system which tramples upon the essential rights of man is doomed even when it is at the very zenith of its power. Froude says that "the period between the accession of Trajan and the death of Marcus Aurelius had been selected by Gibbon as the time in which the human race had enjoyed more general happiness than they had ever known before. Yet during that very epoch, in the midst of all that prosperity, the heart of the empire was dying out of it. The austere virtues of the ancient Romans were perishing. . . . The principles, the habits, the convictions which had held society together were giving way one after another before luxury and selfishness. The entire organization of the ancient world was on the point of collapsing into a heap of incoherent sand" (Short Studies, Vol. II, p. 246). Freeman, another great historian says, "From Mummius to Augustus the Roman city stands as the living mistress of a

dead world, and from Augustus to Theodosius the living mistress becomes as lifeless as her subjects" (Essays, Vol. II, p. 330).

Feudalism, the next great system of human oppression, like slavery, grew out of military conquest. Feudal lords acquired their vast estates not by purchase but as a reward for military service, and upon condition that they and their estates were pledged to the support of the reigning monarch. Feudal society was an hereditary army, officered by persons holding fealty to the king, who were the recipients of grants of land bestowed for service rendered and pledged.

According to the Encyclopædia Britannica, "The law of England recognizes no absolute private ownership of land. The absolute and ultimate ownership of all land is in the Crown, and the highest interest that a subject can hold therein, namely, an estate in fee simple, is only a tenancy." But what was in the beginning only a tenancy became a permanent possession, and the pledge of military service became no longer binding. Feudal

lords used to fight for their country, but it is the common people who now fight England's battles for her and bear the brunt of her taxation. The old obligations and customs, which limited the greed of the landlords and lightened the burdens of their retainers, have largely faded out. The English laborer originally had a right of tenancy in a portion of land, but this was gradually stolen from him. There was an attempt in Queen Elizabeth's time to check such encroachments and an Act of Parliament was passed obliging the landlord to attach four acres of land to every cottage on his estate. This statute of Elizabeth was a compromise reserving so much of the old privileges as appeared indispensable for a healthy life. "But the four acres shriveled like what had gone before. Similarly, in most country parishes there were tracts of common land, where every householder could have his flock of sheep, his cow or two, his geese or his pig; and milk and bacon so produced went into the limbs of his children, and went to form the large English bone and sinew

which are now becoming things of tradition. The thicket or peat bog provided fuel. There were spots where the soil was favorable in which it was broken up for tillage and the poor families in rotation raised a scanty crop there" (Froude, Short Studies, Vol. II, p. 250).

But the landlords stole the commons from the people and passed laws imposing the severest penalties upon those who poached upon these ill-gotten preserves. This injustice gave rise to the rime, which was often on the lips of the people:

> The law makes that man a felon
> Who steals a goose from the common;
> But leaves the greater felon loose
> Who steals the common from the goose.

By means of such and similar usurpations the land of England passed into a few hands. Twenty-five hundred men now own half of the entire country. They render very little public service; they bear very much less than their just share of taxation; they ignore those old obligations and kindly courtesies to their dependents, which were the saving virtues of their ancestors. These modern land-

lords own estates in several counties, and until within a year or two voted for every one of them; but they live most of the time in London and on the Continent. Their only personal interest in these estates is in what they produce, the rents received, and the opportunities for hunting or fishing on their game preserves.

England has been groaning for years under the oppressions of her landlords. Her iniquitous land system, which was framed with a sole regard to the landlords, has driven the people from their ancestral homes by the thousands, while those who still remain are without decent abodes and in a chronic state of poverty. Seven acres out of every eight are cultivated by tenants, only one in eight by owners. The independence of these tenants is steadily being broken and their vitality undermined.

Dr. J. B. Paton gives this very suggestive outline of the wholesale crimes which have been committed against the rural population of England: "During the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries by far the greater part of rural

England was owned and tilled by yeoman farmers and peasants. . . . Even the cotters had four acres of land attached to each cottage, which they held by a fixed tenure at a nominal rent; and this, with rights of pasturage and ingathering of wood over seven millions of acres of common land and open woodland which has long since been wholly closed. The history of those great centuries of Agincourt, of the Armada, and of Marston Moor is largely explained by the character of the men who then dwelt in rural England and formed the bulk of its population. Now the whole of this order of men has been exterminated. The fact remains that England, which was once of all the countries of Europe the richest in men who occupied and tilled their own lands, is now the poorest in this class of men."

When that contest in England over the Budget was going on between the House of Commons and the House of Lords in 1910, the peers threatened to go to the people for vindication. Mr. Gilbert K. Chesterton replied to this threat by

a poem, written in the spirit of Tennyson's Locksley Hall:

Hamlets breaking, homesteads drifting, peasants tramping, towns erased;
Lo! my lords, we gave you England, and you gave us back a waste;
Yea, a desert labeled England, where you know, and well you know,
That the village Hampdens wither, and the village idiots grow,
That the pride of grass grows mighty, and the hope of man grows small,
Will you call on croft and village? Let the rabbits hear you call;
Would you call upon the people? Would you waken these things then?
Call on God, whose name is Pity; do not ask too much of men.

The English land system is a sword which cuts both ways. To make pastures for deer and sheep it drives the people from the country, crowds them into the slums to rot and die, or to scowl and plot against the existing order of things. As a consequence, there is a party in England which is becoming formidable by reason of its growing numbers and influence. It is called "The Condition of

the People Party" and Lloyd George is the recognized leader. He declares that "The supreme task of Parliament is to ameliorate the conditions of their less fortunate fellows, organizing the best of all to avert the worst from each." Mr. George has been described as that "little man the mere utterance of whose name will make an English landlord froth at the mouth." He certainly is making some of them suffer purgatorial pains. No man in England is more loved and hated. A recent magazine writer says: "If Saint George slew mythical dragons in a fabulous age, Lloyd George is freeing England from very real dragons in our own age; and our contemporary, George, the dragon slayer, is no respecter of the established order of things, merely because it is the established order. An evil gets no claim of tenure of him and his allies, even though it show undisputed possession since the days of Alfred."

One of the evils which this modern Saint George is setting his foot upon is this old feudal dragon of land tenure. It is certainly squirming under his investi-

gations. Under his guidance, trained investigators have made their surveys and have completed their tasks. The results are said to be startling—the injustice is so palpable and colossal. In a speech the other day, Mr. George asked, "Do you know what is in front of you? A bigger task than democracy has ever undertaken in England. You have got to free the land. The land is at this hour shackled with feudalism."

The English people have a great deal of saving common sense when they are brought to exercise it. They are coming to the obvious conclusion that the only way to get the people back to the land is to get the land back to the people. Much has already been accomplished by the "Small Holdings and Allotments Act," whereby county councils are empowered to purchase land for sale or lease in allotments of one to five acres or small holdings not exceeding fifty acres. This Act is working admirably and producing excellent social results. "In the city of Worcester, England, where a thousand persons have received allotments, it has

been found that working in the soil has been 'a real corrective and regenerative force' in the case of many artisans whose work was deteriorating until they got land." "Now," says a careful observer, "they are becoming new creatures altogether and taking a new outlook on life."

"Back to the land!" is the slogan that is carrying with it even more blessed consequences in Great Britain and in America. Both countries are on the eve of a rural renaissance. There is a growing determination in England to limit the powers of the landlords in the interests of the whole community. It is proposed to take by taxation part of the increased value of these large estates, not due to any exertion of the landlords, but due to the increasing value and worth of the land—in other words, "the unearned increment." This proposal to tax future, not past, unearned increments is commanding widespread approval. It is just. There is only a limited supply of land; its rise in value can be measured; and this rise, allowance being made for expenses of

development, can be imputed solely to social causes.

It can readily be seen that the taxation of the unearned increment in these large estates will make the holding of them simply for game preserves, or for purposes contrary to the welfare of the community, unprofitable, and will force many of them into the market to be broken up into smaller holdings. About a million acres have already been sold since this agitation began.

England is face to face with this alternative, with its tremendous social consequences: Shall the land be held for the enrichment of the few and the consequent impoverishment of the many, or shall it be made subservient to the well-being of the English people? On one side are lined up the landlords, the corporations, having investments in highly developed lands, insurance companies, exploiters of estates and garden cities, builders, appraisers, solicitors, and conveyancers; on the other side are most of the supporters of the present Ministry and those who are actively seeking to bring to the

great body of the people a larger measure of the opportunities and privileges of life.

Every civilized country to-day regards the breaking up of great estates as a public gain. This has been the salvation of France and Denmark, which have in a century shaken off the chains of feudalism, and are to-day countries of peasant proprietors. An economic policy which induces the sale of portions of large estates has the important incidental result of stimulating the owner to put his land without delay to its most socially advantageous use. The Duke of Marlborough has already announced his intention to plow up Blenheim Park, his ancestral home, which is twelve miles in circumference, and stocked with deer. He offers also to give land for cottages. Referring to the policy of the nationalization of land and the elimination of landlords, the Duke said the other day to Winston Churchill: "I fully believe that if a landlord can show to his fellow citizens that he can administer his land more cheaply than the state, the public will be on his side, for the public is not concerned with theory,

but with practice. . . . A citizen will ask himself whether he is better off under a landlord or under the state. He will ask himself how the change affects him, and if it can be clearly proved to him that the administration of land under a landlord would be better than it would be under the administration of the state, he will prefer not to embark upon the step. As long as I can show, therefore, that I can administer my estates more cheaply and efficiently than the state, that I can employ a greater number of laborers, that I can give them a better wage, and that I can produce a greater amount of foodstuffs than could the state, I believe the British public will preserve me and my administration until the day when the state can show it can administer the land better."

If the English landlords should compete with the state in making their vast estates socially productive, it would help mightily toward the solution of those problems which now press so heavily upon the very life of the people.

CHAPTER III

THE SHACKLES OF PLUTOCRACY

No land and no people have been more favored than America and the Americans. Never were there such boundless resources and so many opportunities for freedom and wealth as those presented to the early settlers of this country. They had centuries of exploitation behind them, but here they found a free field. As in the world's early morning, every man, without distinction of race, status, or condition, could enter and take possession of the richest country under the sun. Lands, forests, and mines were for all. There were no class or feudal privileges, save some colonial grants of land. Any man of force could acquire land, work for himself, hire others to work for him, and enjoy the full product of his efforts.

Not quite three hundred years have passed. The resources of this magnificent country have been so largely exploited by private individuals and corporations

that we are already suffering from the same old evils of towering plutocracy and abysmal poverty which have cursed the Old World. The pressure of population upon the means of subsistence, which has driven millions of foreigners to our shores, is becoming very keenly felt here in this land of apparently boundless resources. America has been and is still "another name for opportunity." Fortunes have been made and multiplied beyond the dreams of avarice. There has also been a wider diffusion of wealth and material comforts than anywhere else. But, notably in the last twenty years, an increasingly larger proportion of wealth has been absorbed by a comparatively smaller minority of people. American society is becoming more and more like a pyramid, with a few multimillionaires at the top, with many living in comfort and affluence in the middle, and an increasing number of poverty-stricken people at the bottom.

Here in democratic America there is a plutocracy corresponding in several respects to the aristocracies of Europe. Our plutocracy is not a class, with a

separate legal status, ruling by virtue of any hereditary title or merely by its wealth. It is "a more or less fluctuating group of very wealthy men, loosely united, primarily, by pecuniary bonds, who, through their wealth and prestige and through the allegiance of like-minded but poorer men, exert an enormous, if not preponderating, influence over industry, politics, and public opinion. . . . In the lawless days of feudal England the lordless man was so unsafe and so despised that he sought out a lord to whom he might become a serf. In our financial world to-day we have a somewhat analogous institution of lordship and vassalage. We have moneyed oligarchs controlling the capital of financial retainers, and we have lordless little capitalists seeking a financial lord. . . . Our plutocracy is based on the trust's position in industry and the trust magnate's position in the trust. . . . The charters of our giant trusts, while sometimes speciously democratic in form, are often autocratic in practice. Theoretically, the owner of a single share of stock has a voice in the election of directors and

the determination of policy. Actually, the mass of the capital may be invested in bonds or preferred stock not carrying voting power, or the individual shareholder may be deceived or disregarded. Stocks rise and fall as dividends are declared or passed, and insiders not only know but determine dividends" (Weyl, The New Democracy, pp. 78–89).

Furthermore, through certain banks and corporations, through a system of interlocking directories with their many arms of power, a few men control a large portion of the wealth of this country. The determination of the money supply and credit has always been a most prolific source of financial aggrandizement and never did it exercise such a tremendous sway and get such large returns as here in America. Chambers's Cyclopædia, under the subject of "Money," makes the following suggestive statement: "The slightest modification of laws concerning money affects every branch of trade, every industry, every investment; yet a small number of the whole people, those whose business it is to deal in money as lenders

or bankers, alone keep that close watch of legislation which enables them to control it unduly, so as to promote their own interests when laws are changed; or if laws are likely to affect their interests injuriously, they are the first to be aware of the effects of changes and to guard against them. That prosperity or adversity may result to a majority of an entire people, by a simple act of legislation on *money*, with a rapidity that legislation on no other subject can parallel, has become obvious to all intelligent people."

Many men have grown rich honestly by their foresight in gaining possessions of lands, forests, and mines, which have increased in value enormously, and also by their inventive genius and exceptional commercial ability. There are fortunes in this country which have come through the fires of financial temptation with no smell of corruption upon them and have distributed blessings with full hand. But in many cases gigantic fortunes have been amassed by those who have secured some monopoly advantage, natural or artificial, either by the consent of the people or by

corruption of the people's representatives. In this rich country, where everybody was so intent upon his own interests that he had little or no concern for the welfare of the people as a whole, there was a most inviting field for the strong and unscrupulous. In the mad rush and multiplication of magnificent fortunes, moral distinctions were often confused and civilized piracy of various kinds became the constant practice of men holding conspicuous positions in the community.

Ever since the Civil War this exploitation of the public resources and the people has held high carnival in business and politics. The public conscience has become more debauched than even in the old days of slavery. Not only a few multimillionaires and corporations, which have become odious and odorous, but a large part of the body politic has become infected by the disease of making "quick, easy, big money," by somewhat devious methods.

This disease is widespread and its ramifications extend to unexpected places. "Every time I attempted to trace to its

sources the political corruption of a city ring," says Lincoln Steffens, "the stream of pollution branched off in the most unexpected directions and spread out in a network of veins and arteries so complex that hardly any part of the body politic seemed clear of it. It flowed out of the majority party into the minority; out of politics into vice and crime; out of business into politics, and back into business; from the boss down through the police to the prostitute, and up through the practice of law into the courts; and big, throbbing arteries ran out through the country over the State to the nation —and back. Not the political ring, but big business—that is the crux of the situation" (Steffens, The Struggle for Self-Government, p. 3).

"Big business is the crux of the situation"; that is, big business in partnership with politics—the organized self-interest of the few preying upon the unorganized interest of the many. The public lands, which were the rightful heritage of the people, have been lavished by Congresses and officials upon railroads and all sorts of

exploiters. Some of those lands have already been sold at enormous profits; other lands are now held against the time when millions of homeless people, by reason of the growing scarcity of land, will be compelled to purchase.

Ex-Governor Johnson, of Minnesota, looking back to the earlier days in his State, says: "The country was full of rich resources, full of rich resources open to anybody—coal, forests, lands, gold. But there's no wilderness now, no more free land, or not much. Everything is claimed, owned. The public domain is practically taken up. The people help develop the country, but they gave the promoters full swing, and that was political power. The men who owned the forests, the mines, the railroads made the improvements; they had to go into politics to preserve their interests. They put into office their friends. They didn't always buy and bribe, you understand; they picked, they nominated men who were friendly to them, who represented them. That is what has broken down our system of representative government. Our govern-

ment represents the men who own the resources of the country, and they make it represent *interests* and not men. They make it take the *business, not the human, point of view.* All power, political and commercial, is centralizing and it is getting more and more of the wealth of the country. The workers as a mass get more, but as individuals ever less and less. The people increase, the country remains the same; we develop more; we add to our wealth as a nation, but the division at the bottom becomes less and less" (Everybody's Magazine, February, 1905).

We are face to face with this burning issue: Shall our civilization be helpfully democratic, or selfishly plutocratic, with millions of the people paying tribute to corporations whose possession of natural resources and control of strategic advantages enables them to dictate prices and fatten at the public expense? Here in the East the anthracite coal fields, a very limited area, are in private hands and the people are dependent upon a small company of men for the fuel which is necessary to life. The community has always suf-

fered at the hands of this monopoly and several times coal famines have brought incalculable distress. During last year, according to a report just submitted to the House of Representatives by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, nine million dollars were squeezed out of the public. The coal operators were obliged to increase wages from eight to ten cents a ton, which footed up, all told, to about four million dollars. But this wage increase was made the pretext for advancing prices, which brought them thirteen million four hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Those operators control the avenues of transportation, the capital invested deriving its increase from both mining and transportation of coal. There is a similar concentration of control of the timber of the United States. "One hundred and ninety-five holders now control nearly half of all the privately owned standing timber of the United States. Forty years ago the government owned three fourths of the timber supply, but it now owns only about one fifth. The great bulk of it passed from government

to private hands through enormous railroad, canal, and wagon-road grants, and by direct government sales in enormous quantities at a dollar and a quarter an acre. The value of standing timber has increased ten, twenty, and even fiftyfold. The largest holders are now cutting comparatively little of their timber. They thus reserve to themselves those incalculable profits which are still to accrue with the growth of the country, the diminishing of the timber supply, and the further concentration of control. Many of the men who have protested against conservation and the national forest system are themselves deliberately tying them up far more effectively for private gain."[1] The bearing of this timber monopoly upon the cost of dwellings for the people, one of the necessaries of life, is evident.

Before Congress last session were bills which sought to give away, without compensation to the government or protection for the people, water-power sites in half a dozen States worth fifty million dollars.

[1] Report of Bureau of Corporations, by Henry Knox Smith.

Protesting against their passage, Congressman Benjamin G. Humphreys, of Mississippi, declared, "We will have a Water Power Trust in comparison with which the Steel Trust and the Standard Oil Trust will seem as mere benevolent societies organized for the dissemination of Christian charity." And Senator Burton, speaking before the Senate, said, "The possibility of a control of the business of the country through the agency of water power is more imminent than any form of control ever attempted in the history of human endeavor." (Outlook July 19, 1913.)

The conservation of the natural resources of the country is only a small part of the work cut out for constructive statesmanship in order to safeguard the welfare of the people. The "big businesses in which there is a visible monopoly element" are crowding to the wall the smaller ones by means of superior banking, railroad, and legislative advantages and by massing their forces, as Napoleon did his armies, upon single points of attack. Weyl, in The New Democracy, says: "The

United Cigar Stores Company (the Tobacco Trust) destroyed in detail innumerable tobacconists. The Beef Trust ruined one by one many individual butchers. The trust magnates have an exactly analogous advantage. As the trust is a powerful unit opposed to an unorganized and comparatively dependent industrial society, so, inside the trust, the magnate, the insider, is a powerful unit opposed to unorganized and comparatively defenseless stockholders. The trust rules despotically over business. The magnate rules despotically over the trust."

The widening domain of corporate control and the narrowing field of individual enterprise are clearly indicated by these facts pointed out by Judge Grosscup: "Nearly one half of the population of the United States—twelve million active workers supporting as dependents twenty-four millions more—are now connected with the mechanical trades. In 1900, according to the census of that year, the whole value of all the farms, the farming utensils, and farm products on hand unsold, amounted to between eigh-

teen and nineteen billions of dollars, while the capital invested in corporations, including railroads, factories of all kinds and their products on hand unsold, amounted to twenty-two billions of dollars. (It would be very much larger to-day.) Thus corporate dominion has within thirty years, beginning with almost nothing, outstripped agricultural ownership by more than three billions of dollars; and, barring city real estate, comprises now nearly one half of the whole wealth of the country. . . . In the swing of the industrial system, the corporation has come to be the gravitating force that holds the activities in their orbit. Is it much wonder that in the eyes of those who look upon the corporation as an interloper it has come to be regarded as a usurper also—the usurper of what the individual labor of men has created—or that in the eyes of those who with clearer vision look upon it as an indispensable phase of industrial evolution, the way in which the corporation shall hereafter be organized and the bounds given to its dominion are coming to be the paramount political problems of

our time?" (McClure's Magazine, February, 1905.)[1]

These corporations, or trusts, have much good in them. They have grown with our growth and are a more economical, more profitable and wiser form of business organization than the haphazard, destructive competition which preceded. The economies resulting from the bringing of so many competing firms under one management, the elimination of waste and cost freights, the use of by-products, the profits derived from larger capital and cooperative effort, the greater stability and permanence which concentration and intelligent use of markets insures are becoming increasingly evident. No nation without the industrial efficiency which such great organizations develop can engage in for-

[1] Professor Franklin H. Giddings, one of the most eminent economists of our country, says: "If I may venture an opinion as to the most important question in political economy before the American people, it is this: Shall the chief and controlling means of production in the United States, including mineral and forest resources, water-power sites, railroads, and means of communication, patent rights, and enormous funds of loanable capital be owned by a billionaire Four Hundred, who, in virtue of such ownership, will be able for all practical purposes to own a hundred or more millions of us ordinary human beings, or shall we ordinary human beings, in our collective capacity, own the means of production ourselves and proceed to work out the reality of a democratic republic?"—*Walter Rauschenbusch*, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 436.

eign trade and successfully compete with other nations which have similar powerful corporations. If a nation cannot sell its surplus products abroad, its commercial prosperity is of a very short duration; mills are shut down, laborers are thrown out of work, and hard times ensue.

In combating the evils of the trusts, harm may be done to that masterly industrial organization which has supplanted many of the ruinous rivalries and waste of destructive competition and made it possible to serve society more efficiently and cheaply. As Lyman Abbott says: "The way to destroy monopoly is not to destroy combination, but to take from combination the power which makes it a monopoly. No combination is too great which is rendering equal, efficient service to the people. Government should aid such combinations to render such service when they are willing; it should compel them to render such service when they are unwilling. When it can neither induce nor compel such service, then it should undertake the service itself. Disorganization of industry is not a remedy for industrial injustice."

The issue is not between trusts and property rights on one side and human welfare on the other. It is because corporate abuses have attacked property rights and human welfare that the demand for the government control of corporations has arisen. The corporations have sometimes acted as if they thought that there are no property rights worth considering except those of corporate form. When the railroads, which had received their franchises and large grants from the public, imposed higher charges than was sufficient to yield them a reasonable return, they infringed upon the property rights of the people at large. Railway property is but ten per cent of the wealth of the country. Property rights worth a hundred million dollars are certainly as deserving of respect as those worth ten million dollars. It was only by a very great concession that the railroads were granted their property and privileges. There was a general consensus of legal authority that to grant the right of eminent domain to take the property of citizens to be used by the corporations as private property would be

a flagrant violation of property right. But because the purpose was to create public highways, subject to the requirements of uniform and reasonable rates under legislative regulation, the grant of the power was lawful. The property rights the railroads or any other corporations possess have been conferred by the public on the distinct understanding that they are subject to the laws. To use them as private property or to further certain private interests is by the very law to which they owe their existence an abominable violation of property rights.

Long before this era of the trusts Chief Justice Gibson, of Pennsylvania, declared that "agreements to suppress competition did not constitute property rights but a criminal conspiracy." Chief Justice Agnew quoted this decision approvingly and repeated its application later. Nothing is better established in law than that combinations to suppress competition and maintain arbitrary rights are criminal infractions of the property rights of all persons affected by the agreements.

The people of this country are coming

to realize with ever-increasing clearness that the public is the real owner of the land. The only question to be discussed is "the degree to which the public shall abstain from exercising its own proprietorship. The manner in which the individual may acquire possession; the security with which he may hold it as against the public's superior claim; the degree to which he may exercise control while in possession, and the extent to which he may project that control beyond the period of his actual possession; the freedom with which he may transfer it to others—all these have been determined in divers ways, in divers ages, and in divers countries; and history shows that the limitations under which land is held for private use have a vital relation to human welfare and human welfare is the paramount consideration to which all property must be subordinated." (W. D. Parkun.)

Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, addressing an assemblage of conservative lawyers in conservative Scotland, said: "It has been shown from reason and upon authority

that the great and beneficent institution of private property rests only upon the general advantage. The particular rules by which the enjoyment of property is regulated differ in every country in the world and must rest at last upon one and the same foundation—the general advantage; and the defense of any such law of property must ultimately rest on this: that it inures to the general advantage; and in free countries, indeed, I cannot conceive any law standing on any other basis. The object of the restrictions placed in England for many centuries upon powers of settlement and devise is invariably stated to have been to prevent mischievous accumulations of property in a few hands. It seems, indeed, an elementary proposition that a free people can deal as it thinks fit with its common stock of property and can prescribe to its citizens such rules as it sees fit for its enjoyment, alienation, and transmission."

Lord Coleridge has made it very clear that no rights to property can have any standing in court when exercised so as to contravene the public good. He men-

tions the case of "a very large coal owner who some years ago interfered with a high hand in one of the coal strikes. He sent for the workmen. He declined to argue, but he said, stamping his foot upon the ground, that all the coal within so many square miles was his, and if they did not instantly come to terms not a hundredweight of it should be brought to the surface and it should remain unworked." Lord Coleridge says: "I should myself deny that the mineral resources placed by Providence under the soil of a country belong to a handful of surface proprietors in the sense in which this gentleman appeared to think that they did. That a few persons would have a right to agree to shut the coal mines of Great Britain seems to me, I must frankly say, unspeakably absurd."

Such ideas as these of Lord Coleridge are becoming very potent in Great Britain, and legislation is being shaped very rapidly in the interests of the people. For twelve years a graduated taxation of inheritances has been firmly established as a part of the permanent financial policy of the United

Kingdom by the most aristocratic and conservative legislative assemblage in the world, the House of Lords. Our legislation here is following the same course. A former attorney-general of the United States declares that in order to turn every dollar of the property of every decedent into the public treasury at his death, no affirmative legislation is necessary. It is only necessary to repeal the statutes now authorizing the descent of such property to the heirs and legatees of such decedent. It is perfectly apparent, therefore, that there is no ultimate security for a single dollar of private property except such as a majority of the voters may decide to be just and wise both to the possessors of such property and to the community at large.

If, as men of the highest judicial authority declare, private property must depend for its security upon what the majority of voters may decide to be just and wise for the possessors and the community, we are face to face with some very serious possibilities. There is everywhere a growing hostility to surplus

wealth; the air is full of accusations by all classes, even by the present and a former President of the United States, that many of these swollen fortunes have been acquired by the exploitation of natural resources, which are the common patrimony of all, by the aid of legislation which should be the impartial servant of all, and by various forms of civilized piracy. Socialism is growing with amazing rapidity, and appealing with tremendous cogency to the people to band themselves together to establish collective ownership in the natural monopolies and in the machinery of production. What will be the effect upon our industrial structure, upon our civilization, when an organized democracy subsisting upon precarious wage-labor takes the field against a limited and lessening number of increasingly rich capitalists?

Such considerations as these show how exposed the precious institution of private property is to the attacks of its foes, and how necessary it is for its friends to safeguard its interests by cutting away the abuses of predatory wealth which inflame

an increasing army of discontents against all property.

Private property is a sacred possession. It is even more essential to the working people than it is to the rich; it is of the utmost importance both to individuals and to the community that honest work and thrift should have their reward. In the present state of the masses, the desire for property and the substantial benefits that accrue from it are a kind of moral gravitation that keeps things in their places. The best interests of the family, the state, and the church are bound up with the institution of private property and are as truly jeopardized by its abuses.

Religion when married to oppression loses its soul and becomes a hollow mockery. The moralities, which are the vital tissues of society, individual and family purity, regard for the rights of others, obligation to one's fellow men, become diseased; voluptuous indulgence saps the strength of the oppressors while it undermines the very society upon which such subjugation of one's fellow man depends. On the other hand, when the mass of

the people are condemned to most degrading conditions, when they live in a daily circulation of misery—toiling but to live and living but to toil; when they are without property or rights, with no chance of betterment save by force, they yield to a fast-developing animalism which riots and tears asunder whatever oppresses them.

Slavery was always wrong and condemned by the new conception of humanity that Christ taught. But it required nearly two thousand years to produce an ethical life strong enough to enthrone this noble conception over ancestral customs and selfishness. Every Christian nation came to see, as we did last of all, that slavery sapped the very best life of the nation, physically, morally, industrially, and that all questions of property rights and State rights must yield to the rights of humanity. The wealth of the South was concentrated just as is the wealth of America to-day. One third of the slaveholders owned four fifths of the slaves. "Had there been no Civil War, the white masses of the South who were becoming rapidly impoverished would have risen

against the small and arrogant slave-holding aristocracy" (Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis). By the same law which was the doom of slavery, the law that the fitness of a social order is tested by its adaptation to the welfare of the people as a whole, our industrial system will be judged and our social problems worked out.

CHAPTER IV

THE INDUSTRIAL STRUGGLE

THE industrial struggle began very early in human history. The Bible gives an account of how in the patriarchal age Laban, an employer, and Jacob, a wage-earner, bargained with each other. Laban called Jacob brother, asked him to say what his wages should be, and also gave him an increasing share in the multiplying flocks. That brotherly business compact, however, did not long continue. There was considerable sharp practice on both sides as each sought to get the better of the other. Finally Jacob broke the compact and stole away with all his belongings.

This Bible incident is by no means a complete picture of economic conditions in that bygone pastoral stage. Servitude was the lot of the mass of the people. Under slavery and under serfdom, which followed, there was an exploitation of man by man. The few thrived at the expense of the many. Between the master and

the slave, the lord and the serf, there was a great gulf fixed which could not be crossed. Wealth was distributed according to status, and the share falling to the slave or to the serf was merely a bare subsistence. There was a certain responsibility on the part of the owner for the welfare of his dependents, and in many cases there was a kindly treatment which lighted up and made endurable an otherwise gloomy and degrading existence.

But slavery and serfdom became increasingly repugnant to the growing conscience of humanity and were finally eradicated. Capitalism, which followed, was a much better economic system, because in some degree it incorporated into man's industrial activities the liberty which had been won in religion and politics. Liberty to work where and under whom one chose, and to share in the fruit of one's work, liberty to buy and sell—this was indeed a precious boon.

Industry, in the capitalistic stage, began by being domestic in its character. Simple handicrafts and small businesses flourished. There was little machinery, and this was

not expensive. The capital required was not large. The employer came into direct personal relations with his workers; the bargaining for wages was between man and man and upon nearly equal terms. But with the expansion of industry and the introduction of extensive and expensive machinery, with the necessity for large capital, the old personal relations between the employer and the individual workman ceased.

In process of time the employer became a corporation, which is composed of persons whom the workman does not know even by name; directors are chosen whose chief concern is to earn dividends for the stockholders. A general manager or superintendent is installed, and under him a number of foremen. But the foreman has nothing to do with either wages or the conditions of employment. His business is to see that the men under him do the work properly for which they are paid. He must produce results; his position and his salary depend upon his success in this matter. He and the workmen under him thus become component

parts of a big working machine. The distance between the capitalist and the wage-earner steadily widens.

Capitalism, in actual practice, drifted away from certain principles and ethical compulsions, which were ever present in the mind of Adam Smith, whose Wealth of Nations is the great classic of this "system of natural liberty." Adam Smith never supposed that ethical considerations would be excluded from the realm of industrial activity. He was a professor of moral philosophy, a science which in his day, in accordance with the lines laid down by Aristotle and followed by the schoolmen, discussed the subject of man's practical activity under the heads of ethics, economics, and politics. These were somewhat dimly regarded, but by no means always recognized, as complementary parts of one whole. Furthermore, Smith believed every man, "with all the inhabitants of the universe, to be under the immediate care and protection of that Great Benevolent and All-Wise Being, who directs all the movements of nature, and who is determined by his own unalterable

perfectness to maintain at all times the greatest possible quantity of happiness." Nature also was thought to be endowed sufficiently by this All-Wise Benevolent Being to make ample provision for the supply of human needs. Hence it was contended that the welfare of all is best promoted by a conformity to natural laws, and by the spontaneous cooperation of individuals seeking each the greatest pecuniary gain for himself.

Adam Smith, however, was too keen an observer of industrial forces not to discern that they often worked contrary to the ends of distributive justice. Hence man's pecuniary interest, in Smith's thought, should always be subordinated to conscience and justice in determining his moral acts. "Every man," he says, "*so long as he does not violate the laws of justice*, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interests in his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man or orders of men." These were the two great essentials of human welfare in the mind of Adam Smith: liberty to seek one's own

interest without hindrance from any man or body of men, and Justice standing guard to protect the rights of all. Liberty and Justice were ever married in his thought; these twain were joined together by that "All-Wise Being, who directs all movements of nature, and who is determined by his own unalterable perfectness to maintain in it at all times the greatest quantity of happiness."

But, unfortunately for human happiness, the freedom to pursue one's own pecuniary interests and the obligation to respect the rights and conserve the welfare of others were put asunder very early in the capitalistic stage of industry. Self-interest degenerated into covetousness, and divorced itself from ethical control. Capital exercised the exclusive right to fix the rate of wages, the hours of labor, and the conditions under which work was done. Even the right of labor to organize for its own protection or advantage was at first denied. Ricardo, Adam Smith's great successor, declared that the laborer was "entitled to only as much pay as would keep the machine

of his body in repair." The pitifully small wages, the excessive hours and crushing burdens imposed upon even women and children, the frightful physical and moral wreckage of that awful period, when this "system of natural liberty" exercised absolute sway, make us blush for our common humanity.

Wealth increased by leaps and bounds, but the tendency of wages was steadily downward; men, women, and children were forced into a degrading servitude. The revelations brought out by Parliamentary investigation made the whole nation shudder. "The Report of 1842," says Mr. Hyndman in his Industrial Revolution, "is crammed with statements as to the fearful overwork of girls and boys in iron and coal mines which, doubtless, had been going on from the end of the eighteenth century. Children, being small and handy, were particularly convenient for mining small veins of coal and for pits. They could get where horses and mules could not. Little girls were forced to carry heavy buckets of coal up high ladders and little girls and boys, instead

of animals, dragged the coal-bunkers. Women were constantly employed under ground at the filthiest tasks."

Many facts of human degradation and misery support the contention that free contract alone is not a sufficient protection for the workman against the inevitable encroachment of greed. The conditions under which the contract between an employer and a wage-earner is made are obviously unequal. Even to-day, when through organization the position of labor has been much strengthened, there can be no real bargain when only one party can afford to risk a refusal, and where capital can say to a laborer, "Take the wages I offer or starve." Capital has grown so enormously and become so federated that even the most powerful trade-unions have been only recently able to bargain on anything like equal terms. Those outside of the unions and without organization are hopelessly handicapped in their contests with collective capital.

Washington Gladden says that "only a small proportion of workingmen are

enrolled in the unions, but all workers have largely shared in the gains that have been won by organized labor. When, in an open shop, the unions succeed in getting better wages or shorter hours, the non-union men get the value of the rise. Much of the legislation by which the conditions of the laboring classes have been improved is due to the initiative of the union. Beyond all controversy, that frightful deterioration of the industrial classes, which the large system of industry sets in deadly operation, has been arrested and the lot of the laboring man has been vastly improved."

Labor has won against tremendous odds its right to organize and contract collectively with capital. Capital, organized and intrenched in law, government, and certain mistaken economic sanctions, for a time obstinately disputed every advance labor sought to make. In the early part of the eighteenth century laborers were not permitted to organize or to combine to better their condition. Even to-day the claim of trade-unions to recognition is persistently denied in some quarters.

In some of the largest corporations unorganized laborers are working twelve hours a day and seven days in a week, for a wage that barely keeps body and soul together. Never was the organization of capital so perfect, and the only thing that stands in the way of a steadily lowering wage and a starvling life is organization and collective bargaining on the part of labor. The humane employer, who wishes to pay better wages, cannot compete with the unscrupulous employer, who, with cheaper labor can undersell the more liberal employer and get his business. Mr. Morrissey, the president of the American Railroad Employees and Investors' Association, in a recent address to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, said: "The efforts of an individual employee of a great corporation to adjust his wages and working conditions to suit the requirements of our time would be about as effective as the attempt to sweep back the torrents of Niagara with a whiskbroom; and therefore society should encourage wageworkers to follow their natural bent—the natural bent of mankind—and to asso-

ciate for their mutual advantage and common protection."

Labor organizations, however, by their policies and methods, have often been open to severe criticisms. They have been guilty of rank injustice both to labor and to capital. As Clay, in his Syndicalism and Capital, says, "The danger of great unions, as part of the social mechanism upon the smooth working of which national well-being depends, is that they exist for the sole benefit of one particular class—their object is to secure the highest possible minimum wage earned by the least possible number of hours' work for the largest possible number of their members. It is obvious that this policy runs counter to the full development of the abilities of the individual, and any attempt by an active and capable member of the union to do better or more work in a given time than the less well-endowed mates is really discouraged. How fully and relentlessly this policy, which is in the highest degree anti-social, has been pursued, is a matter of common knowledge."

Society is in the midst of a fierce class

struggle. This struggle is nearly as old as the race. Ever since that primitive society, when land was held in a common ownership, passed away, there has been a prolonged strife between those who ruled and those who served as to what share each should have in the wealth available for human use. This strife has been carried through all the stages of barbarism, absolutism, and feudalism to capitalism. Two great organized forces, capital and labor, are engaged in a most costly struggle, each trying to get the better of the other, while a goodly proportion of the people are compelled to pay a large part of the cost of this industrial warfare. In that great strike in England, two summers ago, the question at issue was the payment of two shillings more to workmen who received only about a pound a week. But during the contest over that pittance nearly every industry in England was paralyzed; every line of trade and manufacture, every class of the population without discrimination, the poorest with the richest, those who lived by labor and those who lived in

leisure, had to bear their full share of the burden imposed by such an interruption of business. The food supplies of great cities were cut off, mills and mines were shut down, railway traffic was stopped, and violent attacks were made on persons and property, which necessitated the calling out of armed troops. The crisis was so threatening that the London Times declared: "We are assisting at an absolute disintegration of society into its elements in the absence of settled principles of sane direction and of discipline in any shape or form." Lord Churchill, in the British Parliament, declared, that "had the strike continued a week longer, there would have been a cessation of industry; had it continued two weeks, there would have been general starvation."

The right of labor to strike, and the right of capital to refuse its demand must be conceded, but both of these rights are limited by considerations which affect the very life and well-being of the whole community. That strike in England, according to Sir Joseph Rickett, M.P., "stopped just short of forcing the

nation to close grips with starvation, a condition of things so bad that nothing, not an occupation of English soil by a foreign force, would have been comparable with it. London was within a week of the exhaustion of its food supply and a massacre of innocents throughout the country which would have far exceeded the red dreams of the most sanguinary Herod. . . . The nations ought to be willing to keep a fair ring for a fair fight and to impose the rule of the ring upon both combatants; but if the pugilists insist upon carrying on their battles from street to street and belaboring peaceable citizens more than they do one another, there should be intervention of the most drastic character."

But when this call to suppress violence and maintain order is fully considered, there is a great deal of force in the contention of M. Jaurès, in a famous debate with Cleménceau. "What you mean by the maintenance of order," Jaurès said, "is the repression of all excesses on the part of the workers, while admitting violence on the part of the employers. . . .

Violence is gross, visible, when used by the workers. A threatening gesture, a brutal act—they are seen and noticed. Their author can be promptly dragged before judges and dealt with. But how about the employers? Their violence can be carried out in orderly fashion; a few men meet in private, in close security, like an orderly board meeting around a table. . . . They calmly decide that a reasonable wage shall be refused. They decide that those workers who keep up the fight shall be excluded; that by some secret sign in their workbooks they shall be known to all employers—that they shall be marked men. That is the silent method; it is the murderous engine which has caught the unfortunate victim and silently crushes him without any grating noise in the machinery. The workman's share of personal responsibility in any trouble is evenly fixed; any violent act is soon brought home and punished. But the responsibilities of the masters are wrapped up in the complications of anonymous capital, of limited liability companies. There are subtle evasions which

can defeat the ends of justice" (quoted in Hunter's Socialists at Work, p. 247).

Some eminent economists and representatives of philanthropic societies near the close of President Taft's administration petitioned him to ask Congress to create a Commission of Industrial Arbitration "with as great scientific competence, staff, resources, and power to compel testimony as the Interstate Commerce Commission. This commission, when it has sufficiently inquired, shall recommend laws to replace statutes which, in the main, were originally enacted for the different conditions existing" preceding our present modern industrial development. The case of the law-abiding workers at large should be brought before a larger tribunal, "the social conscience of the nation, of which the law is only a partial expression."

These workers to-day view with disheartenment "the long list of occupational diseases, the failure of both employers and the state to prevent them or mitigate their effects; the lack of employers' liability laws, the failure to provide adequate safe-

guards against accident in dangerous vocations, the attacks upon the constitutionality of laws which shorten the hours of women and of workers in certain trades, the reluctance of Legislatures to abolish child labor." Because of these things the petitioners say there is "profound restlessness among certain large classes of laborers who feel that there are no organic ways open through which they can act collectively."

The Survey, after most painstaking investigations, points out many of such evil economic conditions and the consequent social demoralization which menaces human welfare and the very stability of the nation: "By infectious disease, insanitary homes, industrial crippling, and injuries to health, child labor and physiologically injurious work of women, we are creating year by year a large class of subnormal people; and these helpless subnormal people we are exploiting for the profits of manufacturers, mine owners, and merchants, instead of protecting them for their own safety and for the welfare of the race. The means of abolishing all that poverty

which is due to the presence of handicapped and subnormal people is to stop creating the handicaps and to stop increasing the number of the subnormal. By employing little children for wages when they should be in the fields and woods laying the foundation for sound health and a normal life; by working women at night, or at any time under physically exhausting and destructive conditions; by our inadequate housing laws and regulations; by our failure to control infectious disease and to prevent industrial injuries, we are perpetuating poverty. Of course, it is the weaker ones who actually succumb and apply to the dispensaries and charitable societies for aid. These weaker ones are apt to exhibit deplorable personal qualities, such as intemperance, shiftlessness, and general irresponsibility. In trying to help these weaker ones we are very apt to be unduly impressed by their personal defects and to ignore the fact that the social and industrial forces which have borne them to the wall have also operated to injure grievously a larger number who, to be sure, do not ask for aid, but who are

victims none the less of conditions for which society is responsible, with incalculably evil results to themselves and their children."

One of the most cheering signs of the times and a substantial proof that the social conscience is at work is the fact that great groups of employers and employees are settling their differences without bitterness and are cooperating in various forms of profit-sharing and social betterment. Many of the crying evils and degrading conditions pointed out by the Survey no longer exist among some of these groups. The United States Steel Corporation, at its annual meeting on May 17, 1913, stated in its secretary's report that the "seven-day week has been practically eliminated in all the larger plants of the iron and steel industry. Much thought has been given to the question of the hours of labor and better conditions are being gradually worked out. The prevention of accidents has been investigated, and safety devices, costing vast sums of money, but worth all they cost in the prevention of human suffering,

have been installed. . . . A twelve-hour day followed continuously by any group of men for a considerable number of years means a decreasing of efficiency and lessening of the vigor and virility of men. When it is remembered that the twelve hours a day to the man in the mill means approximately thirteen hours away from his home and family, not for one day, but for all working days, it is clear that but scant time is left for self-improvement, for companionship with his family, for recreation and leisure. It is important that any industry be considered in its relation to the home life of those engaged in it, as to whether it tends to weaken or strengthen the normalness and stability of family life."

It is a great gain to the cause of social reform when corporations earnestly consider not merely how they shall earn dividends, but what bearing the work required has upon the mental, physical, and moral well-being of their employees and their families. This larger, humane consideration is imperative. The very efficiency of labor and our industrial pros-

perity depend upon it; so does the stability of the family and society. Our irresponsible, immoral system of competition cares for nothing but profits and getting the better of somebody else. It is the most stubborn obstacle in the way of human betterment. Even the United States Steel Corporation, where, by merging several companies, competition has been partially eliminated, contends that it cannot institute the needed reforms unless its competitors do so. It says: "A twelve-hour day has, by its general acceptance and practice over a considerable period of years, become firmly intrenched, and any sudden or arbitrary change would involve a revolution in mill operations. Nor are we at all sure that it would be possible for any one employer, or any number of employers, to inaugurate a shorter-hour system unless a similar policy should be adopted by all employers engaged in the same industry."

The time has come in this country, as it came thirty years ago in Germany, for us to make the conservation of human life our most important subject of con-

sideration. Everything has been subordinated to the production of wealth. Germany is surpassing every other nation in some respects in her competition for the markets of the world. "The Imperial Minister of the Interior, speaking in the Reichstag, said: 'If Germany has experienced a vast industrial expansion equaled by no other country in the world during the same time, it is chiefly due to the efficiency of its workers. But this efficiency must have suffered had we not secured to our working classes by the social legislation of recent years a tolerable standard of life, and had we not as far possible guaranteed them physical health.' "

There is a growing conviction that this economic burden under which all work in getting a living must be shifted in some way so as to make it easier for the mass of the people. This burden will surely be shifted, but it will not be placed just where capital would like to put it, nor where labor demands that it be placed. No one can predict with any certainty just what adjustment will be made. But

one very important step will be the lining up of all friends of humanity for a compulsory living wage for labor, a wage sufficient for every worker to lead a self-respecting life and maintain his industrial efficiency. This has become a burning issue in England and Germany, and it is receiving serious attention here in America.

This proposal of a minimum living wage seems to many impracticable, and some important measures will have to be instituted before it will be effected. If persons are not permitted to be employed for less than a fixed wage, they certainly must be trained so that they will be worth at least that wage. No minimum wage law could be enforced without incalculable damage to the community unless industrial training to fit the mass of workers to earn that wage were established and developed. The care of the incompetents and the defectives, who fell below this standard, would be a tremendous task, beset with difficulties and exposed to great mistakes, but it would have to be undertaken. Every advance step in the interest of the work-

ing classes has met with opposition and involved great difficulties. When the agitation began against the long hours of labor, in some cases fourteen and sixteen hours a day, and against the employment of children of tender years, it was confidently asserted that such interference would drive business out of the country. But business has not been hurt by such humane restrictions. Whatever will increase the industrial efficiency of labor and conserve the vitality of the race will be found practicable and will contribute mightily to the well-being of the community. A national minimum wage has been established in Australia for ten years and it is working well. Germany has made many long strides in this direction and has in successful operation a score of regulations which are wonderfully conserving the efficiency and vitality of the workers.

Winston Churchill, that keen cosmopolitan observer and practical statesman, declares that "the labor market can be steadied and equalized over a great field. Part of its surplus can be provided for.

Diseased industries can be cut off from the main body or restored to some measure of health. The state can set up a minimum standard of health and wage; it can step in and dispense employment and restorative force to a small body of more or less sick workers; it can supply security to a far greater, less dependent, more efficient class of laborers in recurring crises of accident, sickness, and unemployment, and can do so with every hope of enlisting in its service voluntary forces and individual virtues of great value. Without this apparatus of insurance and security our industrial system is not merely incomplete but actually inhumane."

In her book The Master of the Vineyard, Myrtle Reed tells of a dream by a dissatisfied young man. He was in a great factory; the floor was covered with rubbish and people standing about complaining. Each wanted to do something different from the task allotted him.

"The men who were supposed to work in the shipping-room wanted to cut out the samples that were sent to different firms to order from. The girls who wrote

letters and filed the correspondence wanted to draw designs for new patterns—O, a great many wanted to draw designs! The man who did the designing was complaining of the headache and wanted to be a doorkeeper, that he might have plenty of fresh air. The man who was supposed to oil the machinery wanted to wash the windows—he said it was a cleaner job; and the messengers were tired of going back and forth all day—they wanted to sit quietly and write letters.

"Suddenly an imperious voice called out, 'Each to his own work!' They hesitated for a moment, then obeyed, and presently everything was changed. From confusion and disorder it resolved itself into perfect harmony, for each one was doing his own work and doing it well.

"And as they worked, the spirit of love came among them, and the workers began to sing at their tasks. Each one did not only his own work, but helped his neighbor with his. They became eager to do all that they could, instead of as little as they might and still escape censure, and the face of each one was shining with joy."

"Each to his own work!" The church, the state, the school, the capitalist, and the laborer have each their own work to perform in producing this industrial efficiency and harmony. There must be the spirit of love, the disposition to subordinate the desire for self-aggrandizement to the larger good of the whole, or there never can be harmony and industrial life be redeemed from a selfish scramble. This complex, chaotic civilization of ours must be spiritually mastered and ordered aright or it will master us. This tireless, merciless grind of industry takes little account of human beings. We must make human welfare first, and subordinate everything else to this supreme consideration. But while we insist upon a living wage which will give reasonable comfort and healthful conditions, the people must respond with a reasonable efficiency or employers will join still more loudly in Kipling's refrain,

> Send us the men who do the work,
> For which they draw the wage.

The welfare of the laborer in the future, as in the past, will depend chiefly upon

his own capacity and efficiency. Nothing will ever wholly emancipate him from the struggle for existence, and nothing ever should free him from the necessity imposed by his Creator of earning his bread by the sweat of his brow. "A nature-lover, watching the efforts of a butterfly to escape from the cocoon, saw a period of struggle followed by one of rest; and these were many times repeated. At last the beautiful moth was almost free, only a few fibers remaining which the impatient watcher cut with scissors. It soared upward in the sunshine for a time, fluttering more and more feebly, till at last it fell helpless to the ground, unable to rise again. That final struggle was just what was needed to develop the power of sustained flight."

Discipline and efficiency can be gained only by overcoming difficulties. This never-ceasing struggle against want, this impelling aspiration to better one's condition, is a kind of moral gravitation which tends to keep things in their places and often saves laborers from making wrecks of themselves and of society.

The chiefs attend,
Their efforts bend,
Their staves befriend,
Spring up, O Well.

Thrice happy sign,
When all combine,
With power divine,
Spring up, O Well.

This is a part of an old labor song; perhaps the oldest labor song in existence. It was sung in connection with the digging of a well by the children of Israel on the borders of the promised land. This well was to be the common property, and the leaders together with the people digged; the spirit of good will and helpful cooperation was universal.

When Israel thus worked and sang there were no quarrels or strikes. The murmurings of the desert were stilled. All the people were full of courage and hope, because united in the same work and working for a common purpose. While they made the air vocal with their songs and threw up the yielding soil, the secret springs of God's earth gave forth the precious waters to quench the people's thirst.

It will indeed be a "thrice happy sign" in human society

> When all combine
> With power divine,

—the weak and strong, or, as we should say, the humble toilers of industry working with the captains to make the bounty of nature serviceable to the needs of all the people. This is "a far off divine event," perhaps some one says, but humanity has caught sight of it and has been singing about it all down through the ages; and whatever the people sing about, work and pray for is sure to be realized in human experience.

It is because this ideal is in the heart of humanity, and its realization is so necessary to the well-being of the race, that there is so much discontent and agitation. It is not because the people are worse off to-day than ever before that there is so much unrest; they are better off. Many laborers to-day have comforts and privileges such as princes never enjoyed. Wages are higher than ever; there is less destitution, but social

discontent is more rampant, more aggressive, and more formidable than ever. This discontent is not local; it is not confined to any people or country; it is world-wide and is surging against the supports of society with a force that makes them tremble. The French have this proverb: "The better is the enemy of the good." When men have caught sight of the better they will not be satisfied with a lower good.

CHAPTER V

RENT, THE MODERN FATE

"THE state," Aristotle says, "came into being in order that men exist, but its end is that men might live nobly." Life, especially in the crowded city, is a blind, selfish struggle for existence; noble living is very dimly realized by large masses of people. Suffering and want are their portion. Never was it so true as it is to-day that "from out the populous city men groan and the soul of the wounded crieth out."

By the pressure of population and the steadily increasing price of land people are forced into miserable tenement houses, which are built by greed, and in many cases are horribly unsanitary physically and morally. The saloon is forbidden a place in the better residential districts, but is suffered to flourish where the poor and the unfortunate live, to tempt them from their dreary abodes to drink and debauchery. Squalor and wretchedness

dwell there; blear-eyed men and painted women, the pariahs of society, swarm and die. On the other hand, there is a constant tide of people pouring into the city every morning to use it for personal gain, only to escape from it at night, leaving behind the noise, the filth, and the misery of the slums, while they seek their comfortable homes. One class is driven by a kind of blind fate into the slums. The other class is just as blindly separated from them.

This blind fate may be termed, for want of a better term, rent. In a most despotic way, rent determines where and how people live. Only a very small portion of the people of this country own their homes; most of them rent. In New York city home-owning families number less than one eighth of the total, and in the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx the ratio is less than one sixteenth. Of the eleven cities with over three hundred thousand population each, only one, Cleveland, shows more than one third of the families owning their homes; and of the one hundred and sixty cities with more

than twenty-five thousand population three fourths of all the families are renters. Even in the rural districts the number of persons who own their homes has declined from seventy-four per cent in 1880 to sixty-four per cent in 1900. There has been a still greater decline since. This change "is going on throughout the Union, where the foreign immigration has come in like floods and where there has been almost no foreign immigration." In every large city there is a densely populated quarter of poor people, and a splendid district where live the rich. A great shifting of wealth is continually going on from the many to the few. Less than two hundred thousand families own nearly fifty billions of the one hundred and six billion dollars of our nation's wealth. Less than two million families own thirty billions more; of the remaining sixteen million families, one half are worth, on the average, between two and three thousand dollars, and the other half have less than five hundred dollars. There are seventy-five millions of our eighty-five millions of people who have, on the average,

less than four hundred dollars' worth of property of any kind.

These facts reveal what a large proportion of our population is under the pitiless law of rent. The very prosperity of which we boast, the growth of the city, increases the value of the land and raises the price of rent. As a consequence, the poorer people, who have to live near their places of employment, are crowded into smaller quarters and are compelled to pay more for what they have. The humble tenement house, where one or more families used to live, becomes the abode of several families. Then houses are converted into barracks, which are often constructed without any regard to the safety or the comfort of the tenants. Then begins the custom of subletting, and the middleman, or agent, appears. Nothing now stands between greed and the defenseless inmates. The sunlight is shut out, the foul air is shut in, and the fouler moral atmosphere engendered by so many persons of both sexes and all ages living, often without partition or screen, in one room.

Here is a typical case which exemplifies the struggle going on in most of our population. John Smith is a clerk and lives with his mother and two sisters. He earns fourteen dollars a week; one sister gets five dollars a week at a store and the other earns ten dollars a week as a typewriter. The total weekly income of the family is twenty-nine dollars. John is engaged to be married. He gives his mother six dollars a week, reserving eight dollars a week for his own expenses. His sisters give their mother all their earnings except what is needed for carfare. The sum for the weekly expense is therefore twenty-one dollars, out of which the mother must keep the family housed and fed, and herself and her daughters fed and clothed. The rent rule is that the monthly rent must never exceed the weekly income. Twenty-one dollars a week income, therefore, means that the Smith family must live in a tenement whose rent does not exceed twenty-one dollars a month. For a while they live comfortably, but they get no increases in wages, and cannot save any money. After a while the expan-

sion of the city reaches their outlying neighborhood and the rent is raised. This increases the burden, but the family struggles on. John marries, but he cannot afford to set up a separate household, nor can the mother and sisters afford to live without John's contribution. A year or two passes and the rent goes up again. John's wife has a baby. They look for a cheaper house, but cannot find one. They have to move into a flat with five small rooms, but the breadwinners get small increases in wages, and keep up the struggle. But another baby comes; another raise of the rent, a spell of sickness, a few weeks without work follow; and they must move again. They find still smaller rooms, in a slum tenement, where they live in wretchedness, deteriorating in body and soul. They are on their way to the slums.[1]

This is a typical case. It is characteristic of every large American city to-day. The strong and the clever make a better fight than John Smith, and some climb up to

[1] The main features of a careful study of New York tenement life by David Graham Phillips.

comfort and even wealth; but many persons are neither strong nor clever, and are overmastered by the phenomenal rise in rents and prices. "A house that rented for twenty-five dollars a month four years ago now rents for forty dollars a month. A house that was worth four thousand dollars six years ago is worth six thousand dollars to-day." These figures are not true of every community, but, in general, there is a progressive increase in rents as there is in the cost of living. Rents advance faster than the means of transportation between home and work, and much faster than wages. This means that the masses in a city must live more and more huddled together, and the very poor, especially if they are weak, must go into the slums.

It is an awful struggle. This is the modern fate. The increasing population makes the demand for subsistence greater, but the owners of land and natural resources, which are limited, find in this increasing demand an opportunity for constantly higher charges upon the productive ability of the community. This makes the struggle for a living harder and harder.

It presses upon all, but it *grinds* upon the poor and the incompetent. In every great city thousands are born into conditions that undermine their physical, mental, and moral stamina, while the path to success is becoming more crowded and the requirements for getting an honest living are being steadily raised. If a boy or girl born in a Christian home, with all the advantages of the schools, finds the struggle severe, as many of them do, how terrible must be the odds against the children of the slums?

The incompetent are being pushed to the wall in large numbers; some because they have thrown away their opportunities, and have been demoralized by drink, but others because they are too weak to fight their way in the surging throng; they are handicapped by the very society which has trodden them under foot. Incompetency is a relative as well as an individual matter. It is due to the very standards imposed by the competent. The competent determine how the race of life shall be run; they set the pace and rush on to victory, while many of the

weak, maimed, unfortunate, and the victims of drink and disease are out of the race and drift into the slums. Weyl, in his New Democracy, points out how closely the slum is identified with our modern strenuous society: "Our poverty has changed, as has our country, from a rural to an urban variety; from a poverty more dependent upon economic maladjustments. Our later poverty is unrelieved by the presence of free land. To-day, when the poor have the advantages of city sanitation, free schools, dispensary and hospital service, better water, cleaner streets, freer legal advice, free libraries, etc., a larger mass of men and women tremble on the verge of crime and dependence than ever before. We have established higher standards of success, and those who fall below these standards, whether through mischance, lack of training, inebriety, or physical or mental weakness, are more miserable than they would have been in a cruder society, in which an inefficient man could always secure *some* sort of a job" (Weyl, The New Democracy, p. 221).

Emerson says that "at birth every child is loaded with bias, and that the purpose of culture is to remove all impediment and bias and to secure the balance among the faculties so as to leave nothing but pure power." It is the office of parental nurture to change this bias and remove these impediments of which Emerson speaks in order that the child's activities may be set free and generate only pure power. It is the mission of religion to supplement the home in this noble work. Indeed, the home cannot do its work without the help of religion. The home, however, is losing its old-time salutary influence because of the encroachments of worldliness among the well-to-do and because among the poor so many millions are herded together in hovels, not homes.

One could hardly conceive of a society more destitute of spiritual nurture than that presented by whole acres of densely populated districts in some of our cities. The amazing wonder is that anything good ever comes out of such abodes. Thousands of poor unfortunates are impelled there by a power which fascinates and controls

them, drawing them down with terrible force.

> They faint, stagger to and fro,
> And wandering far from the stream, they go
> In pain, in terror, in distress,
> They see all round a wilderness.

But even in the slums, even in the dryest places, spiritually, man is not far from the rivers of soul-refreshment, because in his latent manhood there is an innate goodness which is a part of the very life of God which courses through all things like water in the soil. Olive Malbery has told how, when she was "living the life" with the women in the East End of London, "she had worked and walked for a whole day without being able to earn enough money to get a bed; the very little she had she spent for food; then she wandered along and at last found herself on the Thames embankment and sank down on one of the benches, wearied, exhausted, bitter in spirit, and with the weight of it all upon her sensitive heart, buried her face in her hands and was weeping. And by chance there came her way a poor ragged outcast

woman who had loved the 'garish day' and had had her garish day; but upon that day a night had fallen, and she was abandoned, homeless, hopeless, penniless save for a solitary halfpenny which she clutched in her hand and was about to spend at a coffee stall. She saw the tiny slip of a young girl crying on the bench and came up to her, bent over her, put her hand on her shoulder and said, 'Never mind, dearie, you will soon get used to it.' "

Olive Malbery looked up through her tearful eyes, and less because of her sorrow than because of her wonder at this woman's tenderness and compassion, could not speak a word. The woman hesitated an instant and then pressed into the hands of this chance fellow-sufferer the only coin she had and disappeared swiftly into the night.

It isn't easy to see the latent goodness in such women.

It is easy enough, in the light of a fathomless love,
To see the divine gleam forth from the eyes of one's friend,
To catch the reflection of stars from the skies above,
And watch the undying flame of a changeless love ascend.

But to read it in eyes that have looked on earth's
baser side
With that sweep of desire in the soul for the things
of the night,
The unbroken image of God where God is denied—
How may we find the divine kept out of our sight?

To love the red rose, and a brave and beautiful
life,
When the true eyes flash with a godlike grace
into thine,
Is human; but love for the wrecks of the world's
sad strife,
Where the stamp of the godlike is hidden, is a
thing divine.

Sir Oliver Lodge, in his book Man and the Universe, says: "There is a lot of innate goodness in humanity—and to enable it to blossom and flourish it needs little more than material care, the same sort of care as is freely lavished upon a garden. Plants themselves do all the flowering and fruiting, if only the gardener exposes them to sun and air and keeps them clear of parasites and weeds. Let this only be done for humanity and it will flourish exceedingly; it will repay the culture a hundredfold." Sir Oliver doubtless claims too much for what better

housing and improved material conditions could do for people. But this is certain, a Christian civilization is not doing what it should in the way of planting and nurture for those intrusted to its care. The psalmist says, "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful." But those in the slums are practically compelled to walk in the counsel of the ungodly and hear nothing but oaths and obscenities; they stand in the way of the sinners by day and lie down with them by night; they sit in the seat of the scornful and hear not only religion but all the moral supports of society derided continually.

They need to be planted by such rivers of water as the psalmist speaks of, they need to be placed amid growthful and refreshing surroundings, where their souls may have a chance; where they can live in the light of God's truth, and where the noxious parasites and vices continually preying upon them may be cut away.

"Consider the lilies how they grow,"

Christ said. The lily unfolds from within by a mysterious life, operating we know not how. Its feet may be in the mud; it may be imprisoned for a time in the darkness, but it obeys the call of the light, grows toward it and opens its heart of gold to the sun.

Consider the lilies of humanity down there in the slums how they don't grow; they have come forth fresh from the hand of God, but they do not flower. Why? A modern poet asks,

"What of a child I gave?"
God said to me—
"The little one I died to save
And gave in trust to thee?
How have the flowers grown
That in its soul were sown,
The lovely living miracles of youth,
And hope and joy and truth?"
. . . . . .
"The child's face is quite white,"
I said to God.
"It cries for cold and hunger in the night.
Its little feet have trod
The pavement muddy and cold;
It has no flowers to hold,
And in its soul the flowers you set are dead,"
"Thou fool," said God.

Fools indeed we are to suppose that the flowers of the Spirit can grow in such surroundings without the sunshine of Christian sympathy and the fresh air of gospel truth. Fools are we to suppose that this underworld will ever be right unless we do vastly more to set it right. Fools are we to think that we can be inactive, that we can nurse our slothful sympathies in the presence of this encompassing misery and not be under condemnation.

Even trees, when properly planted and in favorable conditions, degenerate if simply neglected. "In one square yard," says Darwin, "I counted thirty-two little trees, and one of them, with twenty-six rings of growth, had during many years tried to raise its head above the stem of the heath and had failed." Deserted trees growing in abandoned farms or forsaken gardens soon lose their glory; neglected orange trees become thorny and bear small, bitter fruit; neglected apple trees degenerate in like manner. Here and there as one rides through the country may be seen the lonely survivors of vanished orchards. They have not been pruned

or digged about or sprayed. At first their contorted branches turned their new-found liberty into license. Then came the evil days, the drought, late frost, insect destroyers. And there they stand and seem to reach out their mute branches for help—fitting symbols of the poor, pest-smitten people in the slums.

Mr. Jacob Riis declares that, "as a class, the tenants in the slums are better than the houses they live in; they respond quickly to improved conditions." When the magnificent courthouse in a great city was approaching completion, a little girl used to come every day from the slums to look with wondering admiration upon its noble arches and aspiring towers; she wandered up and down its corridors, gazed with eager interest upon the bustling throng and handsome furnishings, and every night went home to her dismal attic refreshed. A new life was quickened within that child; a new impulse was created, and she yielded to the invitation of a kind-hearted woman to go to school, although she had spurned all such offers before.

Environment has a much greater influence upon human character and achievement than we think. "A party of women once had the privilege of inspecting a factory devoted to the manufacture of spool-thread. Their guide was the proprietor of the factory, which is one of the largest and most complete in the world; but what most impressed the visitors was not the size and evident prosperity of the plant, but the beauty of the place. Not only was every hygienic and commercial necessity attended to, but, so far as possible, every æsthetic consideration was observed as well. Around each wall of the spacious, well-lighted rooms where the work was done ran a broad, exquisitely painted frieze. The figures upon it were a dainty, dancing company, beautiful in color as well as in form, and fit to grace the walls of a palace. Finally one of the women, a practical, plain-spoken dame, asked the millowner why he made beauty such an object. 'I don't see the use of such a frieze in a factory like this,' she said bluntly. 'Why do you have it?' The

millowner smiled. 'Well, come to think of it, it's a very practical reason,' he said. 'I find that it makes better thread.' "

Will not the contemplation of the beautiful, in improved tenement houses and surroundings, make *better human thread* as truly as *better spool-cotton?* This movement for the improved housing of the people has taken on large proportions. In London, nearly two hundred thousand people are living in these new model tenements, while a far larger number are transferred to cottages in suburbs. In New York city whole acres of disease-breeding tenements have been razed to the ground and in their place have been erected beautiful buildings with abundance of light and air. Every apartment, whether it has two, three, or four rooms, is private in all respects, equipped with modern conveniences and in some cases a block of such houses is connected with a small park. It has been found that for the same rentals now paid in slum-dwellings much more room is given in these new homes, and the hygienic and housekeeping and moral comforts are improved beyond

comparison. These buildings are not charity establishments, but business enterprises, paying to the investors four or five per cent in money and to the community a physical and moral rate of interest beyond all computation.

If the overcrowded, unsanitary tenement stands for the exasperation of one part of society against the other, as it does, the improved tenement and industrial school are the means of reconciliation and the bringing them together into social harmony. Several years ago Plymouth Church, in Chicago, established a mission school in one of the poor districts. Through the benevolence of one of the members of this church, Mr. Armour, there were provided for the neighborhood reading-rooms, a free library, kindergartens, a free dispensary, and a modern tenement block of two hundred and fifty flats. Much good was done and a better feeling began to prevail. But something more was found to be necessary. Dr. Gunsaulus, the pastor, says: "Despite all these influences, the boys were going to ruin. They were well taught, but they did not

know what to do with their hands. Their bodies were full of passion. They could not control themselves. We saw that they must learn how to take care of themselves. It was almost as bad with the girls. Many of them were very pretty. They were going downtown for work, and by reason of their small wages were exposed to great temptations. So the Institute was started to teach boys and girls the secret of self-help and self-control. The result has been all that we could expect, more than we had anticipated. There are now about a thousand pupils in the Institute. Our buildings are not large enough. More pupils apply than we can receive. The Institute has changed the entire character of the region. In fact, its influence extends over the whole city."

All the work of the Institute aims at teaching young men and women how to make their way in the world. There are sewing and cooking and manual-training schools, schools for electrical science and the various mechanical arts, and a department of physics. The power of this Insti-

tute and the respect with which it is regarded by the worst elements of society was shown on one of the awful days of mob rule in Chicago. Dr. Gunsaulus was in one of the upper stories of the Institute, looking down on the mob below. It was surging along the railroad tracks, threatening destruction wherever it went. All around were burning cars. Some one cried out, "These are old Armour's buildings." But no attempt was made to destroy them. Dr. Gunsaulus went down to the mob and, selecting ten men, asked them to go with him through the building and see what Mr. Armour had done for the laboring people. They were shown everything. Nothing was said about the strike. The building suffered no injury during the disturbances.

There is an inviting field in every city for what is called "investment-philanthropy," which means public spirit and business enterprise, governed by conscience and directed for the benefit of those to whom the community owes a helping hand. It is not charity that is most needed, but justice. No class of

persons in a Christian community should be compelled to pay a rental of ten per cent and upward for housing which means physical and moral degradation, when by a little organization on the part of the community better accommodations can be provided as cheaply and give as large a return upon the investment as the best bonds yield.

This is one of the most promising methods for advancing the kingdom of God. Many methods of religious work barely keep us alive spiritually and do not reach those Christ came to save. Our Christianity must swarm or it will die on our hands. Christ is popular with the masses, but the church isn't, because she does not sufficiently minister to the needs that seem to them sorest. We must show our neighbors in the slums that Christianity provides the means of social betterment, that it throws open the door of opportunity to the good things of earth as well as to the felicities of heaven. The corrupt politician renders the poor many substantial acts of service and often shows himself more friendly than most

of the professed followers of Christ. It is natural that the discontented masses should follow his lead and that retribution should fall upon the community.

The Christian Church and every reform movement must be directed much more than they are to those things which, as Carlyle says, "burn away in mad waste the divine aromas and plainly celestial elements of our existence, which change the Holy of holies into a place of riot, which make the soul itself hard, impious, and barren. Surely, the day is coming when men will be born right the first time to be born right the second time," when every human being shall be surrounded by such conditions of living and means of improvement that he may become an independent, God-fearing, humanity-loving man. Then, and not till then, will the kingdom of God fully come.

CHAPTER VI

THE NEW SOCIALISM

What is a communist? One who hath yearnings
For equal division of unequal earnings.
Idler or bungler, or both, he is willing
To fork out his penny and pocket your shilling.

THUS ran an old corn-law rhyme in "the hungry forties" of the last century. There are communistic yearnings to-day, but communism has no standing. Nearly all of the ninety communistic societies which once flourished in America have been abandoned.

Socialism does not contend for "the equal division of unequal earnings" or of property. It would give every one as far as possible the full product of one's labor and the right to acquire property for one's own consumption. Socialism is opposed to the exclusive ownership of natural resources and the use of the means of production and distribution for the profit of individuals rather than for the welfare of the community. It reasons

that human liberty and welfare are so dependent upon the wise use of the bounty of nature and the machinery of production and exchange, which is largely a social heritage and product, that these should be under the cooperative control of society and not be exploited for the enrichment of the few. Socialism aims to make industry, like government, democratic; it seeks to bring about a real solidarity of interests; it wars against plutocracy, which exploits humanity by means of special privileges, just as democracy warred against aristocracies and monarchies and their assumption to rule by divine right.

Socialism is often misunderstood and misconstrued. Even the Republican party, which has exercised an intellectual leadership for so many years, asserted in its platform of 1908 that "Socialism would destroy wealth; Republicanism would prevent its abuse; Socialism would give each an equal right to take; Republicanism would give each an equal right to earn; Socialism would offer an equality of possessions which would soon leave no one anything

to possess; Republicanism would give equality of opportunity which would assure to each his share of the constantly increasing sum of possession." This loosely constructed plank shows either a culpable ignorance of Socialism or a willful perversion for the sake of influencing voters.

It is a safe rule not to judge any organization by the extreme utterances of those who speak for it. Socialism has been more or less revolutionary; so has democracy. Socialism has had its dreamers. What movement that has blessed humanity has not? But Socialism to-day has more doers than dreamers. It is concerned, not with Utopias, but with realities; it recognizes that men and women everywhere must organize to bring about a better social order; they are not to be content to sit with open mouths and wait for the blessings of the millennium to fly in.

Socialists are far from being doctrinaires and visionaries. They are not composed, as Mr. Mallock of England imagines, "of academic students, professors, and clergymen, and also of emotional ladies, who

enjoy the attention of footmen in faultless liveries and say their prayers out of prayer books with jeweled clasps." Mr. Mallock makes fun of the *phalansteres* of Fourier, which appear to have been "imaginary anticipations of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Here, lapped in luxury, they were to feast at common tables, and between meals the men were to work in the fields, singing, while a lady accompanied their voices on a grand piano under a hedge."

Mr. Mallock is a very able writer, but he has some very strong prejudices. He ought to know and does know that Socialists are not long-haired men and emotional women. There are no more sagacious men in modern political life, none who can give and endure harder blows in the struggles of practical politics, than Bebel in Germany, Jaures in France, Keir Hardie in England, and Debs in the United States. Theodore Mommsen, the famous German historian, says, "Everybody in Germany knows that with brains like those of Bebel it would be possible to furnish forth a dozen noblemen on the east of the Elbe,

in a fashion that would make them shine among their peers." And another writer says: "Bebel speaks of poverty, of misery, of vice as a man who has known of and suffered from these things. He knows how to excite his listeners' pity, not for imaginary facts, but for painful and sad truths. He knows how to make them touch with their finger all the evils of which he speaks." Bebel has recently died mourned by the German people and with a record for able, unselfish social service that has seldom been equaled.

The Socialist leaders do not belong to any Waldorf-Astoria crowd; they know the grind and the grime of the struggling millions; they realize the aspirations of the humble toilers and how they are often choked back by dire suffering and want. Every true worker for humanity, sooner or later, comes to feel what the aristocratic editor of the London Spectator said recently: "I am no more content than are the Socialists with things as they are, and I most earnestly desire that they should be made better, and would gladly consent to any and every pecu-

niary sacrifice demanded by the Socialists, *if I thought that such sacrifice would provide a remedy.*" This is the proper attitude to take toward Socialism—that of thorough respect for its endeavors to find a remedy for certain ugly evils of the present economic system, however doubtful we may be of the practical value of some of their proposals.

Socialism, like Democracy is not a party nor a political program, but a movement. It is not the child of to-day but the heir of all the ages. Humanity has always "groaned and travailed in pain" for a better social order, which should usher in the kingdom of God. The Hebrew prophets used to predict the coming of the time when every valley of oppression should be exalted, and every mountain and hill of tyranny should be brought low, and whatever is crooked with injustice should be made straight. No Socialistic orator of to-day is more denunciatory than those prophets were of the monstrous injustice of their times or more scathing in their criticisms of the predatory rich than were the fathers of the early Christian Church.

There was much that was Socialistic in that early church, although the church, unlike Socialism, put the emphasis upon the spiritual factor in the redemption of society, rather than upon the economic. The primitive church had no political power and no commercial influence. It was only by great caution that it maintained even a precarious footing. But the early Christians in a very marked degree cared for the proletarians; every Christian church was a brotherhood, far more than any labor organization has been. Despite its many shortcomings, the church has done more than any other institution for laborers, for the poor and the oppressed. Whatever moral potency and sacrificial zeal there are in the Socialistic movement to-day owe more to the diffusion of Christian principle and spirit than to all other causes combined. Socialism, like Christianity, is known by its ideals and fruits, not by its perversions and the baser matter that is often mixed with it. No reputable Socialist now counsels or expects that the social changes desired will be accomplished by violent

revolution. It is true that Karl Marx, whose very able book Capital has been a Bible for Socialists, argued with a remorseless logic that under the present system of society the rich will become so rich and oppressive and the poor so poor and desperate that the struggle between the two will precipitate a revolution. But the latest writers and most influential leaders of Socialism do not expect such "a catastrophe," and know very well that if it did occur, it would be a tremendous setback to their cause. Jaures, the great French leader, strongly opposes "a general strike"; for "in that event the working masses, by stopping production and exchange, will themselves be starved." He warns the working class that "there is only one method of attaining the triumph of Socialism. That method is to gain the support of the majority of voters by legitimate means." Bebel, in Germany, in a speech on "the general strike" said: "To attempt such an adventure is to furnish to the reactionaries the very occasion they desire to reduce still further that which remains of our liberties." And John Spargo,

that brilliant Socialist writer and leader, denounces Syndicalism because it divides the house of labor against itself. "Too late," he says, "we discovered one of the oldest laws of the psychology of popular movements, the law that the policy adopted in the struggle against the common foe inevitably appears in the eternal conflict of the movement. Teach men and women in the labor movement to practice sabotage in the fight against their employers and it will not be long before they will practice sabotage within their own organizations to obtain factional or personal ends. A contempt for the will of the majority is developed, for 'sabotage is peculiarly the weapon of the rebel minority.'" In 1912, the Socialists of the United States in their national convention declared that "any member of the party who advocates crime, sabotage, or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party."

The aim of Socialism is not in the direction of "a general strike." That is what Syndicalism demands. Socialism, on the

contrary, hopes gradually to organize industry on the basis of the collective ownership for the good of the community. This is the common aim of all Socialists, but when any really definite proposal is made for the taking over of property from individuals by the state there are decided divergences of opinion as to how it shall be done and what compensation should be paid. As Mr. H. G. Wells says: "But Socialism is no panacea, no magic 'open sesame' to the millennium. Socialism lights up certain once hopeless evils in human affairs and shows the path by which escape is possible, but it leaves that path rugged and difficult. Socialism is hope, but it is not assurance. . . . Directly one accepts its great generalizations, one passes on to a jungle of incurably intricate problems through which man has to make his way or fail—the riddles and inconsistencies of human character, the puzzles of collective action, the power and decay of traditions, the perpetually recurring tasks and problems of education" (New Worlds for Old, p. 332).

These are the days of munificent gifts

for educational purposes, but there is no probability that our multimillionaires will donate their wealth to be used for industrial purposes. Sir Henry Fowler, once a member of the Liberal Cabinet, quoted a conversation on the nationalization of the land he once had in which Gladstone, after listening in his quiet and stern way, broke out with these words: "Do you mean to pay for it or do you not? If you mean to pay for it, it is folly; if you do not mean to pay for it, it is robbery."

Whatever the earlier and more radical Socialists may have said about expropriating property without compensation to the owners, such revolutionary projects are repudiated by all reputable Socialists to-day. Bernstein, the editor of the most influential Socialist journal in the world, says: "Rights of property which the Common Law allows must be inviolable so long as and in the measure in which Common Law allows them. To take away lawful property otherwise than by compensation is confiscation, which can only be justified in cases of extreme pressure of circumstances, such as war and epidemics."

Bernstein and other Socialists are prepared for "compensation" on a more or less liberal scale, but there is no general agreement as to the details, or how such a colossal consolidation of business enterprises, beside which the United States Steel Corporation and the Standard Oil Company are mere pigmies in comparison, are to be financed and put on a paying basis.

There is no more sensitive nerve in the whole body politic than that of property. Whenever it is touched, the number and solidarity of the friends of property are strongly in evidence. While there is an increasing concentration of wealth in the hands of the very rich and a corresponding increase of the very poor, the number of those who have moderate possessions grows both relatively and absolutely. Notwithstanding the phenomenal size and number of gigantic trusts, the great mass of business is still done by persons outside. Bernstein, in his able refutation of Marx's "catastrophe" theory, that the absorption of industry by the comparatively few gigantic capitalists would precipitate a

revolution, gives many facts in support of his contention that "the large undertaking in industry, including business dependent upon it, even in such an advanced country as Prussia, represented at most only half the population engaged in production. The picture is not different if we take the statistics for the whole of Germany, and it is very little different in England, the most industrial country in Europe. In other foreign lands, with the exception of Belgium, the relation of the large enterprise to the small and medium business is still more unfavorable (to Marx's contention). But in agriculture we see everywhere the small and medium holding, as compared with the large one, not only greatly predominating but also strengthening its position. In commerce and distribution the relation of the groups of undertakings is similar" (Evolutionary Socialism, p. 98).

The cooperative societies in England alone have two million five hundred thousand members with a capital of one hundred and twenty-five millions and a trade of five hundred millions a year. The five million

seven hundred and thirty-seven thousand farmers in the United States would certainly object very vigorously to any scheme to nationalize their land. The peasant proprietors on the continent of Europe have generally held themselves aloof from the Socialist movement. The number of shareholders in American railroad and industrial properties in the year following the panic of 1907 increased from two hundred and twenty-five thousand to three hundred and seventy-five thousand. Each shareholder naturally desires to uphold the corporation in which he has invested his savings. The considerations which encourage workers to acquire property are stronger than those which breed discontent. So many persons by their thrift have risen from poverty to plenty that such splendid possibilities are continually beckoning others to struggle up the shining path.

Karl Marx declared that the Socialist was "a sort of midwife helping the old order give birth to the new with as little pain as possible." This prediction is coming true. Society is not wholly capitalistic

nor wholly socialistic, but a combination of the two. It is undergoing great changes in its structure, functions, and spirit.

We are all Socialists in some things. We all believe in collective ownership and direction as exemplified in common schools and postal service. Everyone is convinced that museums, art galleries, and libraries are better managed under public than under private control; so are a score of public utilities and philanthropies. All over the world the scope of public enterprise and service is steadily widening. In Europe the railroads, the telegraph, the telephone, and express business are largely under government control, and in many cities both in Europe and America water, gas, electricity are municipally owned. Great progress has also been made in better housing for the people, abolition of child labor, also in workingmen's insurance, old-age pensions, and other forms of social service.

The functions of government will doubtless be still further extended, and there will be more organic changes in the ownership and conduct of industrial enterprise,

which will be steps toward the realization of the Socialist ideal. The socialization of wealth for social uses, the control of the natural resources and utilities, the means of transportation and exchange, and even the machinery of production, partially if not completely, is the goal toward which our present industrial evolution tends.

The difficulties in the way are administrative and moral. The present tasks of democracy, though mainly political and comparatively simple, are imperfectly performed. What excellent judgment, broad knowledge, wise administration, and noble patriotism will be required in a democracy, industrial and political, where "all shall be for each and each for all," where every man shall seek his profit and joy in the welfare of the social whole! John Spargo, in the New York Daily Call of November 14, 1909, says: "One of the most pernicious and deplorable things in connection with the present situation in the Socialist party is the fact that self-seeking demagogues, with more or less success, make it their business to create artificial divisions in our ranks, and to foster hatred and sus-

picion when comradeship and trust are so necessary. Take, for example, the attempt to range the proletariat against the so-called 'intellectuals' of the party. . . . They would keep out every man or woman who ventures to place superior education or mental training at the disposal of the party. Fearful lest they be overshadowed and no longer acknowledged as leaders, they resort to all the arts of knavery and demagoguery to destroy those whom they regard as rivals. That they rob the movement of great and vitally necessary services is to them nothing—they place their petty ambitions above the interests of the cause."

Miss Vida Scudder, who is an enthusiastic Socialist and has written one of the best books on Socialism in the last ten years, says: "Should Socialism arise otherwise than as the result of an inward transformation, affecting the deep springs of will and love, it would prove the worst disaster of any experiment in collective living that the world has seen. It would involve immensely elaborate machinery. It might be an unbearable tyranny. It would bring with it a penetrating dis-

cipline, perhaps the most universal in pressure of any that history has evolved. In all probability, we shall not enjoy this condition of things at all."

What is to bring about this inward moral transformation of which Vida Scudder speaks? What is to open these deep springs of good will and love, set them bubbling in human lives and flowing through society? It will take some power more potent and holy than class comradeship, party loyalty, or a crusade for human betterment, to subdue the fierce animalisms that now raven in society and discipline the people into that wise self-control which an industrial democracy needs more than any other form of government. It must have the Christian forces to make its industrialism effective, and the Christian forces must have Socialist aspirations and applications in order to transmit ethical energy sufficient for the needs of such a gigantic organism. The dynamics so essential to such a Socialism can be supplied only by a religion strong enough to overcome the selfishness entrenched in human nature and vested interests.

CHAPTER VII

HOW GERMANY IS SOLVING SOME OF OUR SOCIAL PROBLEMS

GUIZOT, in his History of Civilization, declared that "there is not a great idea, not a principle of civilization, which has universally spread, that has not first passed through France." But the sovereignty in ideas which France once possessed has passed to Germany. "The best that is known and thought in the world" has now for fifty years or more first gone through Germany. Most of the leading professors in leading universities in England and America have taken either post-graduate courses in Germany or received substantial help from German books. Germany has taken "all knowledge for her province" and made significant contributions in every field that she has entered.

Her industrial development, however, and her efforts for the social amelioration of her people are of comparatively recent origin. Though she towered above all

other nations in scholarship, in music, and in general education, England, France, and the United States surpassed her in wealth and in the economic comfort of their people. As recently as 1875 Germany's industries were in a chaotic condition and she was on the verge of commercial ruin. Her working class, embittered by poverty, cried out for relief and were turning to Socialism and its glowing promises. Bismarck and those in power at first tried to stamp out the rampant social discontent. At that great strike in Westphalia, the emperor warned the strikers that "every Social Democrat was an enemy to the empire and to the country." Liebknecht and Bebel, the Socialist leaders, were put into prison because their writings were regarded as treasonable. Notwithstanding her towering intellectual achievements and the freedom enjoyed by her scholars, there never has been in Germany such free speech on political matters as there is in Great Britain and here in the United States. Every political meeting is "under the supervision of a gendarme who may declare a meeting illegal if he

considers the speeches dangerous." Capitalists generally made common cause with the imperial government in its endeavors to crush Socialism. "The brewers and rich proprietors forced many saloon-keepers to refuse to let their rooms for Socialist meetings."

But in spite of all those stern repressive measures, Socialism grew tremendously. It won so many seats in the Reichstag and polled such a large vote that Bismarck was compelled to come to terms with it and to make substantial concessions.

On May 9, 1884, Bismarck, in a speech on industrial insurance, proclaimed *the right of work*. "Give the workingman work as long as he is healthy," he said. "Assure him care when he is sick; assure him maintenance when he is old. Was not the right to work openly proclaimed at the time of the publication of the Common Law? Is it not established in all our social arrangements that the man who comes before our fellow citizens and says, 'I am healthy; I desire to work, but can find no work,' is entitled to say also, 'Give me work,' and that the state

is bound to give him work?" "But large public works would be necessary!" exclaimed an opponent. "Of course," replied Bismarck. "Let them be undertaken. It is the state's duty."[1]

Germany began then and there to provide work for her unemployed; to care for her sick, disabled, and aged. She instituted that system of workingmen's insurance by which now one hundred million dollars a year are distributed in benefits and indemnities.

These humane provisions met with stubborn opposition. The big capitalists prophesied ruin, as they have again and again in England and America whenever any legislation in behalf of the laboring classes has been proposed.

Self-interest always makes men near-sighted. What is immediately profitable often hides from view the larger benefits beyond. If one holds up a silver dollar,

---

[1] John Burns: "Is it the loafer by trade, do you think, who is willing to shiver for hours under the dark gates, in the black gelidity of a December morning, for the chance of a shilling's worth of work, and work that needs as much muscle as will? . . . I have seen dock-hands fighting for the gates like people tussling in the passages of a burning theater, with a fierce physical energy (moral inspiration apart) which the chronic loafer, if he would, is powerless to exert."

one can shut out the sun. Those German business men argued that the heavy burdens placed upon capital by the new legislation could not be borne, and that German industry would be handicapped in competition with other nations. They overlooked what capital has so often and persistently overlooked, that labor, like land, may become so exhausted that it is unprofitable; it must be enriched to become productive. Better conditions for labor have always increased its efficiency and contributed to the profits of the capitalist. From the time that Germany began to protect her working classes and ameliorate their condition she entered upon a career of remarkable commercial prosperity which has been maintained to the present day. She is the most formidable competitor of all the nations in the markets of the world. Her exports have increased at a rate proportionally faster than those of any other country. Her wonderful prosperity would never have been achieved without the improved physical stamina and morale of her working people.

Germany also inaugurated a new system

of political economy which made man the center and not wealth. Manhood, and not money, was the real standard and measure of value in her industrial life. When manhood is debased all good things are cheapened and life itself is not worth living. All real interests are conserved, all problems may be solved, so long as men and women are kept strong, pure, and good. In a speech on "Child and Female Labor," in the German Reichstag, Parson Stoecker, then the court chaplain, said: "We have put the question the wrong way; we have asked, How much child and female labor does industry need in order to flourish, to pay dividends, and sell goods abroad? Whereas we ought to have asked, How should industry be arranged in order to protect and foster the family, the individual, and the Christian life?" Parson Stoecker, over twenty years ago, pointed out the direction that all sane thinking on economic problems and all stable industrial progress has since followed.

Along with those measures of social amelioration and an enlightened political

economy instituted by Germany was the imperial, ever-persistent policy to develop industrial efficiency. In the first place, there was the compulsory elementary education of the whole people, which is more successfully carried out than in any other country. There is also a disciplined life at home, in the school, and in the workshop by which all the people are organized and directed into such professions, trades, and vocations as shall best conserve the interests of the individual and the state. Elmer Roberts, in his able book on Monarchical Socialism, published last year, gives an interesting account of how proper vocations are found for the young, and where they can acquire the greatest efficiency:

"Every boy is the subject of expert observation by physicians and teachers and parents to find out his adaptations and inclinations. No boy is compelled to choose a calling; the endeavor is made to stir the boy's ambition. The parents working at common labor almost always want their son to do better in life than they have done. They try to fix in the boy's mind that he ought to choose a

trade and fit himself for one of the highest levels where intelligence counts for something and where wages and opportunities are larger. . . .

"The germ of the whole system of manual training is considered by the Prussian Ministry of Commerce and Industry to be in the awakening of the boy's aspiration for a life above the ordinary. The aim is to start the boy in the direction of a particular trade, his studies to be completed in compulsory education in a trade school." "Of twenty-two hundred boys who left the highest class of the elementary schools in Munich in an average year, twenty-one hundred and fifty went into some skilled occupation at once. Thus two per cent only were lost to skilled industry. Not one boy from the schools is known to have allowed himself to fall into that ugly classification, 'the unemployable.' "

"The teacher tries to impress upon the youthful mind the worth of labor, that pleasure in making, producing, creating may be one of the truest joys of life. The elementary reading books include a

variety of such stories as this one entitled, 'The Gentleman in England': When the celebrated philosopher and printer Benjamin Franklin came to Europe he had with him a Negro servant. Franklin, as is well known, was very inquisitive, and traveled through the whole of England in order to see factories and other objects of interest. His servant went with him and also saw everything. They finally returned to London. The following day Franklin said to the Negro, 'Now that you have seen all of England, how does it please you?' The Negro shook his head and said: 'England is a very strange country; everybody works here. The water and the smoke work, the horses, the oxen, and even the dogs work. The men, the women, the children work; everybody works, except pigs. The pig does not work; he does nothing but eat and drink and sleep. The pig alone is gentleman in England.'

"It has long been a house-law of the Hohenzollerns that each should learn a handicraft. The emperor is a bookbinder. The crown prince is a turner; another

of the emperor's sons is a blacksmith; the third, a brass worker. The empress and her daughter, Victoria, are excellent sewing women, and have gone through courses in cooking. The effect of this school instruction and of these royal examples is to make the boy really believe that virtue, happiness, and the rewards of life are derived from work; that neither a prince, a member of the Cabinet, an officer, nor a millionaire can escape work, or, indeed, that he wishes to avoid it."

Furthermore, everything is done to facilitate the entrance of boys into the various industries under the most favorable auspices possible. "The continuation trade-school administration works with the official labor exchanges of the empire in the endeavor to direct the choosing of trades into those callings where the greatest opportunities exist for employment. The Central Labor Bureau for Prussia draws up a sheet at the end of each month which shows exactly the number out of employment in all trades. Taken over a period of years, it is thus easy, of course, to determine, relatively, the chances of

employment. The design is to replace this haphazard distribution of workers by a balanced system. The boy who can know nothing accurately about the position of the labor market will be spared the tragedy of going into a dying trade.

"Everybody, from the emperor down to the humblest citizen, is trained for a definite place. There is no haphazard. 'What do you want to be, Johnny, when you grow up?' a workingman's son was asked. His father promptly replied: 'He's going to be an expert mechanic. Johnny has nothing to say about it.'"

Such interference with individual choice shocks our American ideas of personal liberty and seems oppressive, but ten to one Johnny will be well trained and never be out of a job. And Germany has a larger proportion of trained, efficient workers in every department of activity than any other nation. As one has said, "The entire fabric of this new industrial nation is woven together for endurance and efficiency. The woof, an all-powerful, wonderfully trained government; the warp, an industrial population wherein every indi-

vidual is specially trained for a place; these are woven together in the loom of daily doing, into a national texture which is becoming the admiration of the world. Germany is the land of efficiency, because it saves and uses everything from babies to bent nails; the land that keeps everything in supreme order, where there is no waste land. A man from Chicago went up to a Munich policeman and said, 'For God's sake show me a rubbish heap.' "

How does Germany deal with "big business"? There are some four hundred trusts or syndicates in Germany. The state and the imperial governments are favorable to them. Indeed, these governments own immense producing properties. They are members of some syndicates, or work with them. The official political economists Wagner and Schmoller teach "that production on a great scale must inevitably replace individual company production, just as factory production took the place of cottage industry." In Germany they know how to curb and not cripple big industries. No strong party, not even the Social Democratic, seeks to

restrain the power and growth of the syndicates, because they are all under national supervision and are administered in accordance with principles of equity, which take into account industry, trade, and agriculture as a national whole. As Roberts says: "The prosperity of Germany, while it has demonstrated that the rich are getting richer, has not demonstrated that the poor are getting poorer. . . . The prosperity of the country and the arrangements of the state for allowing the mass of the workers below to share somewhat in it have lifted the whole people, except that sad thin stratum of the defective and the inefficient at the bottom" (Monarchical Socialism, p. 129).

There are two principal kinds of Socialism at work in Germany—monarchical Socialism and the Socialism which is represented by the Social Democratic party. This party, although it is the largest, and last year polled four and one fourth million votes, has never been in power, has never administered a municipality nor passed a law. It is not a party of revolution, but of reform. While it

has often compelled capitalism in self-defense to make substantial concessions, capitalism, though it is constantly being modified, still dominates Germany. The other party is monarchical Socialism, which is essentially capitalism in this modified form. It has already instituted a collective ownership of mines, railways, forests, lands, and other productive enterprises. Indeed the state and the imperial governments have both found collective ownership profitable and pay one fourth of their expenses out of the profits of their big businesses.

Germany is both monarchical and democratic, like her emperor. He still insists upon his imperial prerogatives as the ruling representative of the family of the Hohenzollerns and is constantly striving to hand down undiminished powers to his son, but he is abreast of the most progressive economic thought of to-day and by his tremendous energies is promoting the distribution of wealth, education, and industrial efficiency so as to conserve the economic and spiritual well-being of his people. The empire itself, by its socialization of its old political

forms and its state-owned enterprises, has made substantial advances toward Socialism. By meeting Socialism half way and adopting some of its ideals, both the monarchy and capitalism are retaining their hold upon a large portion of the people. Every enterprise taken over by the state brings so many more persons under direct supervision of the state. The social distinction given employees of the government, the prospect of a pension, and that they are sure of work during good behavior, draws them into a compact organization against which the more extreme Socialists must battle to gain the ascendancy. The party in power, too, very wisely profits by the criticisms made by the Social Democracy, and is continually making readjustment where injustice is being done.

The benefits and the limitations of government control of industry are well stated by Professor Marshall, England's great economist: "In Germany an exceptionally large part of the best intellect in the nation seeks for employment under government, and there is probably no

other government which contains within itself so much trained ability of the highest order. On the other hand, the energy, the originality, and the daring which make the best men of business in England and America have not yet been fully developed in Germany; while the German people have a great faculty of obedience. They are thus in strong contrast to the English, whose strength of will makes them capable of thorough discipline when they see the necessity for it, but who are not naturally docile. The control of industry by government is seen in its best and most attractive forms in Germany; and at the same time the special virtues of private industry, its vigor, its elasticity, and its resource, are not seen to their best advantage there. In consequence, the problems of the economic functions of government have been studied in Germany with greater care, and with a bias that may be a healthy corrective to the bias in the opposite direction of the English-speaking countries" (Principles of Economics, Vol. I, p. 48).

The same modifications in Socialism

and capitalism which are so evident in Germany may be discerned in England and the United States. Both have already surrendered certain principles which each once considered essential. There are, it is true, some "standpatters" on both sides, who make their idle protests, while the great tide of human progress sweeps on, leaving them behind. There is also that rising host of Syndicalists, which has little following in Germany, but is becoming formidable here in the person of the "I. W. W.," which scorns all peaceful methods as too slow, and is determined by "the general strike" to usher in the social revolution. But these malcontents are not Socialists; they are repudiated by Bebel, Jaurès, and others. They are anarchists, and anarchy and Socialism are farther apart philosophically than capitalism and Socialism. Syndicalism is already losing its power in France, and it will here for the same reason. There are so many property owners; and they will line up solidly against anything that looks like revolution. The people have too much common

sense to seek to better themselves by destroying the very means of production by which they get their bread. It is true that small groups have, in moments of frenzy, done this, and such acts of violence may very likely break out again. But both capitalists and wage-earners have been taught how expensive class war is, that the real field of conflict is public opinion, and that votes are far more effective than bullets or bombs. Even the Socialist party no longer appeals exclusively to the wageworker or the proletarian, but to the more inclusive groups of workers and producers. A modified appeal is made to the small farmer, who is to-day exploited by large capital; to the small manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle against concentrated capital. The goal of the party is the social ownership, not of the land and the means of production, but of the land and the means of production which are used for exploitation.

Neither here nor in Germany is Socialism making much progress toward the realization of its extreme theories. It

tries all the while to make its principles and ideals attractive, and in the meantime it presses its demands upon the law-makers to widen the functions of government. In Germany it has compelled the government to become schoolmaster, physician, insurer, and to perform other duties which enter into Socialistic housekeeping; government is being increasingly made a function by all for all.

On the other hand, political leaders here are acting as shrewdly as those in Germany by incorporating what is good in Socialism into their own party programs and spreading these humane principles as sails to catch the popular breezes. Several years ago Tchaykovsky, the celebrated Russian liberationist, was interviewed by Mr. Ray Stannard Baker, one of the ablest journalists in the United States. Mr. Baker asked Tchaykovsky what he thought were the prospects of Socialism in America. He replied that he did not think that "Socialism stood much chance in America because the political leaders of the other parties were so cute that they would never allow Socialism to gain strength.

As soon as any item in the Socialist program became popular they would see to it that that issue was taken up by one of the older parties. In this way they would go on taking the wind out of the sails of the Socialist party." Shortly afterward Mr. Baker was talking with Mr. Roosevelt, who was at that time President, and told him what Tchaykovsky had said. Mr. Roosevelt slapped his leg in his energetic fashion and exclaimed "That is exactly what I have been doing."

Greater than capitalism or Socialism, greater than any or all parties, is this social evolution in which society is involved. It is the progressive manifestation in our day of forces which have been at work in society ever since Christianity came into the world. There are a hundred groups in every nation all working independently but unitedly toward a common goal. As Weyl, in his New Democracy, says: "One group in the community strives to end the exploitation of child labor. Other groups seek to extend and improve education, to combat tuberculosis, to reform housing conditions, to secure direct

primaries, to obtain the referendum, to secure government inspection of food, to regulate railroad rates and corporations, to conserve our national resources, to humanize prisons and penal laws, to protect the community against penury caused by old age, accident, and sickness, to divert to the public a larger share of the unearned increment, to accomplish a thousand other results for the general welfare. Every day new projects are launched for political, industrial, and social ameliorations and below the level of the present lie the greater projects of the future."

CHAPTER VIII

CHRISTIAN PAGANISM

HERBERT SPENCER contended that there is "a thin layer of Christianity overlaying a thick layer of paganism. Christianity is nominally honored and professedly obeyed, while paganism is nominally discredited and practically obeyed."

This statement is too sweeping, but it has much truth. The Christian religion "is a treasure in earthen vessels" which have always been more or less pagan. In the early Christian centuries Christianity appropriated pagan temples for her worship and adorned her churches with pagan art. She also incorporated pagan philosophy, ceremonies, and festivals into her theology and worship. Pagans were received into Christian fellowship and brought some of their paganism with them. Primitive Christianity parted with some of its purity as it grew in popularity, and when, under Constantine, Christianity was enthroned as the religion of the em-

pire, it became imperialized, and under the sign of the cross prayed and lusted for the conquest of the world.

In all centuries since, Christianity has been transformed in some measure by every people and age she has sought to transform. Not that the Spirit of Christ has ever departed from her; she never could have achieved one of her conquests without this divine power. In all her worldly associations and combinations her faith in divine Providence, her love for Christ, her stern insistence upon purity of life, and her heroic self-sacrificing spirit have always been maintained in some significant degree. These spiritual graces have grown with her growth and still flourish in this mammon-loving, mammon-worshiping age of ours. The soul of the Christian religion is still united to Christ, her Living Head, and through her magnificent social memberment pulsates a real spiritual life.

The Christian religion, it is true, has in this materialistic age lost something of the simple, glad joy felt by the early Christians; the evangelical message has

been overlaid, and sometimes smothered, by doctrines, ordinances, and ceremonies; the simple Christian fellowship, which is the real bond of Christian unity, has often been supplanted by denominational zeal.

But Christian faith, love, and hope are still "the salt" in a corrupt world, "the Light" shining in darkness, and "the leaven" in huge lumps of carnality and wickedness. Some of the salt sometimes loses its savor, the light is diminished and devoured by dense darkness, the leaven lost in the lumps it seeks to make porous with Christian principle. Humanity, however, is sweeter, more enlightened, more sympathetic than ever. Christianity has been "all things to all men," and some things she never ought to have been, but she is the strongest organized force for righteousness in the world to-day, and humanity is more dependent upon her than ever for the spiritual dynamic it so desperately needs.

But this civilization of ours is far from being Christian; it is densely pagan in places. Luxurious sensuality, and brutal-

ized poverty such as disgraced and destroyed Rome, are conspicuous in all the capitals of Christendom. Furthermore, even the principles, maxims, and methods of our ruling economics have been and are to-day in a somewhat less degree, pagan. Our economics at the start professed to be "a system of natural liberty." Every man was declared to be free to seek pecuniary gain with a sole regard to his own profit. The law of supply and demand alone was to determine the wages paid to labor as well as the prices paid for commodities. In the early part of the last century the laborer had no right to organize for his own protection, or to strike, or even to seek employment in another locality. The great Ricardo regarded labor as a machine, and, like other machines, "entitled to only so much as would keep his body in repair." Women and children were condemned to work fourteen, and even sixteen, hours a day in conditions that were destructive of health and morality. In the long history of "man's inhumanity to man" there are no darker pages than those of English

industry when capitalism carried out this "system of natural liberty" to its logical consequences—the enrichment of the few and the impoverishment of many. Apparently, in those days, capitalism was without humane considerations. It lay upon its soul the flattering unction that this spontaneous association of individuals, seeking each the greatest pecuniary gain for himself, was in accordance with the will of God, who, by these natural economic laws, provided for the happiness of all.

But society could not long be maintained under a system which was accompanied by such a frightful amount of human wreckage. Liberty is a precious boon, but when unrestrained by justice it becomes the worst of tyrants and destroys itself. The rapid deterioration and demoralization of the industrial population stirred the conscience of the English people and led to the passage of the famous Factory Acts. These Acts, by their merciful provisions, restrained English capitalism from digging its own grave and destroying the English nation.

Capitalism in America has not been

essentially different in principle and practice from that in England. The conditions here have been far more favorable for the people in general. Land has been abundant and cheap; labor could choose between the factory and the farm; many more opportunities to become "the architect of one's own fortune" have been presented and improved. But for several years the pressure of population upon the means of subsistence has been keenly felt; the cost of living has been rising at an alarming rate. Producers, by the aid of a subservient Congress, have built a wall of protection around their products, thus giving them an enhanced value, while at the same time they have thrown the ports wide open to millions of low-class laborers to keep down the wages of native Americans—even importing gangs of such laborers under contract, until forbidden by law. Women and children have been employed at excessive hours and low wages, thus demoralizing male labor and stunting the race.

Laborers, on the other hand, have often been as sordid and predatory as capitalists.

Resentful at the sight of such enormous wealth, and embittered by their own wretchedness, they have often struck wildly and been as darkly pagan as the proletariat at Rome in the days of agrarian riot.

How does Christianity regard this modern industrialism which dominates so many of the activities of this age? She regards it in much the same way that she did the paganism of the Græco-Roman world and as she has the various world-powers with which she has coped since. Her attitude is not one of wholesale condemnation, like that of some of our radical reformers. She is in this world to save it, not to destroy it, especially such an integral part of it as this modern industrialism which has so much that is essential to the well-being of humanity. Christianity sees "the soul of goodness in things evil"; she seeks to save that and destroy what is wholly bad, while "from seeming evil she educes good, and better thence again, and so on in infinite progression."

Modern business is far bigger and better than the competitive system under which

it carries on its operations. And capitalism, despite its attendant evils and its mistaken attempts to subordinate everything to the pursuit of wealth, is immensely better than any economic system which preceded it. No radical Socialist, despite his fulminations against capitalism, would exchange it for feudalism, or slavery. The evils of capitalism blind many persons to the substantial benefits it has conferred upon humanity. By its masterful organization of industry, by its marvelous machinery of communication and transportation, by its utilization of natural forces to feed and clothe humanity it has immensely promoted human happiness. Indeed, this modern industrialism is a most magnificent fulfillment of the divine command "to subdue the earth, and till it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, the fowls of the air, and every living thing that moveth upon the earth." This marvelous material development in which men have gained so conspicuously in power—power over themselves and over nature—this concentration and conservation of energy is a most significant stage

in human progress and full of promise for the future.

Nothing in society ever stands still. Every member decays and passes into disuse or glows with new life and develops new functions. Nothing is changing so rapidly as this industrial member which has such a vital relation to us all. The competitive anarchy when every man's hand was against that of every other man has passed away. Men in business are not so free to do as they please as they once were; free competition has given way to regulated competition. The gigantic conspiracies of business and politics for the enrichment of the few, irrespective of the welfare of the many, are passing. "The strangle-hold" at least is broken. There is now everywhere a settled determination that every organization, commercial and political, shall be in strict subordination to the best interests of the community, and that the rights and liberties of all the people shall be safeguarded.

There never has been a time when the economic activities of mankind could be

so easily ordered by an enlightened people as now, when the natural resources, the industrial output, and the money of the country are so fully concentrated. The machinery for bringing in a better order of things is ready. What society is travailing in pain for is for men able and good enough to run its industries efficiently and make them more socially productive—for captains and privates of industry who will work as enthusiastically in the industrial realm for the good of the people as many are working in religion and politics.

It may seem presumptuous to believe that this kingdom of material interests is becoming, as some other kingdoms are, "the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ." But wherever the ruddy currents of human life flow, there the spirit of Christ is just as truly at work as it was under the very ribs of paganism at Rome.

Even in that Roman civilization, which was stricken through and through with corruption, with emperors as detestable as men ever were, with greed and sensuality raging in all classes, the pure

religion of the lowly Nazarene found much with which to affiliate and combine. There was that Roman organization of imperial forces, its mighty cities and magnificent roads, running into all the then known world, which could be made centers and highways for the spread of the new religion. There were also those stern and lofty ideals of justice, public spirit, and fortitude, which, though often shamefully disregarded in practice, persisted in the minds of even the selfish and the base. Roman history had examples of patriotism as noble and self-sacrificing as our own Washington and Lincoln. Such a heritage, though often squandered and desecrated, is never quite lost among any people. It is ever full of blessed potency, and whenever it receives the kindling touch gives itself freely for the public good. Even in the days of Roman degeneracy, "The temper was there, the fire of public duty, the public spirit which accepted without complaint trouble and sacrifice. . . . It produced a race of now nameless and unremembered men, who, while they probably forgot many other duties, forgot

not their duty to the public, of which they were the servants" (Church, Gifts of Civilization, p. 144).

"The history of the Cæsars," writes Merivale, "presents to us a constant succession of brave, resolute, and faithful soldiers, men deeply impressed with a sense of duty—content to toil in obscurity and shed their blood at the frontiers of the empire, unrepining at the cold mistrust of their masters, not clamorous for the honors so sparingly awarded to them, but satisfied with the daily work of their hands and full of faith in the national destiny which they were daily accomplishing. Here are virtues, not to be named, indeed, with the zeal of missionaries and the devotion of martyrs, but worthy nevertheless of a high place in the esteem of all who reverence human nature."

The Christian religion came into Rome when the old paganism had lost its power, when the principles of moral action had become confused and the patriotic spirit was dying. To that impoverished Roman people, wearied with the constant sight of imperial profligacy and popular degrada-

tion, came a little band of Christians with their wonderful Christ. He was goodness itself in human form. He had "the Godlike function of making sinful men holy" and filling even "the lost," even the proletariat, with "the power of an endless life." The goodness imparted by Christ to his followers became a practical working reality in business, in the gladiatorial arena, and even produced "saints in Cæsar's household." It charmed and tamed the passions of men; it resisted successful wickedness; it quickened whatever was good in Roman character into new life, preserved whatever was valuable in Roman civilization, and made it serviceable in the upbuilding of a better social order.

Our twentieth-century civilization is infinitely richer in saving elements than Roman society, for it has grown up with, and is more or less closely identified with, Christianity. "We are told that the presence of electrical force in one body induces a corresponding force in another, not in contact with the first, but adjacent to it; that one set of forces is raised to

greater than their normal power and intensity by the neighborhood of another; that currents passing in a given direction communicate, as long as they continue, new properties to a body round which they circulate; the neutral iron becomes a magnet, attracting, vibrating, able to hold up weights, as long as it is encircled by a galvanic circuit, which does not touch or traverse it. . . . So Christian forces act by a remote and indirect sympathy, even where they do not mingle and penetrate in their proper character."[1] In this modern business world, which has so much that is alien to Christianity, there are Christian men as there were "saints in Cæsar's household," and Christian slave-holders, sixty years ago, who felt deeply the scandal of keeping their brothers in bondage, and, in some cases at great personal sacrifice, set them free. There are saints in business and politics to-day, who inwardly protest against the unscrupulous methods and debasing practices which they have to meet. These noble men have "the stress, strain, and battle-pain" which

[1] Church, Gifts of Civilization, p. 144.

everyone experiences who lives up to a higher standard and walks by an inner light. There are more and better saints in this mercenary civilization than there ever were in the monasteries, when persons devoted all their energies to becoming and staying pious. God goes into partnership with rich men as truly as he befriends the poor. He blesses industry and thrift. And the community should not withhold from any man who has earned his money honestly his just meed of praise, or take from him by unjust taxation what his brains and energy have won. It will be a sorry day for America, as it was for Rome, when men are persecuted whose fortunes have been honestly gained and worthily employed.

Wherever greed is supreme and wealth is regarded as the sole end of business, the principles of the Christian religion are inoperative and seem to be impracticable. But it is beginning to be believed that these principles would be of immense value commercially if they were generally and mutually applied, and that such application, if once made, would

usher in the greatest economic prosperity the world has ever known.

It is becoming economically evident, what has always been and will be forever true, that "he that saveth his life shall lose it," and "he that loseth his life" for Christ's sake, or for the sake of humanity, "shall find it." Our competitive system, which has always squarely opposed this principle, is being found to be impracticable; it has gone as far as it can and is already breaking in pieces. The trust is a confession that the selfish scramble of competing interests was not profitable. Business could no longer be carried on under the law of the jungle. Capital and labor have again and again been at a deadlock, and industry has been paralyzed. When the capitalists on one side, and the laborer on the other, give as little and do as little as possible—for that is what this system, or lack of system, leads to when carried to its logical consequences—business becomes a nightmare and industrial anarchy is rampant. The wrangle of capitalists and laborers is keeping the industrial world

in a constant turmoil. There can be no stable prosperity so long as each class contends so fiercely for its own selfish interests. War in any form is fearfully destructive, and industrial war is the most destructive of all. The community is always the greatest sufferer. It has been long-suffering and much more kind than it should have been, but it will not endure this selfish scramble much longer.

What does this general uprising against special privileges and these strenuous efforts to establish industrial arbitration mean, but that the law of the jungle is no longer practicable or profitable, and that some higher law must take its place? The welfare of the individual and of society alike demands the subordination of all selfish claims and interests so far as they conflict with the good of the social whole. Society is yearning for a nobler, more brotherly, more Christian civilization. There is more social conscience to-day, more responsibility felt for the disadvantaged and the distressed than ever before. There is a greater recognition of the obvious Christian truth, which has

been so commonly disregarded, that whatever one possesses one holds as a steward and not as an owner in a world where all men are brothers and where the obligation of mutual help, so vital to the preservation of the family, is just as essential to the well-being of society.

The changes in our thought and action in political and sociological matters have been more momentous in the last twelve years than in decades before. On the 14th of September, 1901, William McKinley was shot at Buffalo. There never was a more popular President than he. There was never an administration more harmonious, or more strongly intrenched in the sources of political power. It was the golden period of corporate aggrandizement. The Senate ran the country and some rich men with predatory interests ran the Senate. The Republican party, apparently, was well satisfied with itself, with the country, and with business conditions. There were eating, drinking, and making merry over political pottage and a complacent regard for the "full dinner pail" of the laborer. There was no anti-

trust agitation. The policies of the Republican party were in close alliance with men whose businesses were rapidly becoming monopolistic and exacting tribute from the American people. Had such policies been continued and such monopolies flourished until now the people would have been bound hand and foot.

How suddenly and dramatically the political scene shifted! McKinley fell by an assassin's bullet, loved and lamented as no President since Lincoln. The bosses of his administration have all passed away, and many of their policies and practices are reprobated. The Republican party is very different to-day from what it was then, and it will be still more different when it gets together again, and champions, as it did in its very beginning, the moral uprising of the people. The Democratic party is also changed since honest Grover Cleveland choked back its greed and compelled it to keep the peace. It is still greedy and breaking its long fast, but it has higher ideals and is obedient to its schoolmaster in the Presidential chair. Power is shifting into the hands

of the people, and the dominating purpose of the best politics to-day is to apply the democratic principle industrially as well as politically, and by wise legislation and helpful ministries lighten the burdens of the people and safeguard their interests.

A keen observer, William Allen White, declares: "Now for ten years there has been a distinct movement among the American people—feeble and imperceptible against the current during the first few years of its beginning—a movement which indicates that in the soul of the people there is a conviction of their past unrighteousness. . . . It is now one of the big self-evident things in our national life. It is called, variously, Reform, the Moral Awakening, the Square Deal, Insurgency, and by other local cognomens; but it is *one* current in the thought of the people. And the most hopeful sign of the times lies in the fact that the current is almost world-wide. The same striving to lift men to higher things, to fuller enjoyment of the fruits of civilization, to a wider participation in the blessings of modern society—in short, to 'a more

abundant life'—the same striving is felt through Europe and among the islands of the sea that is tightening the muscles of our social and commercial and political body. . . . The good will of the people—the widening faith of men in one another, in the combined wisdom of the numerical majority—indicates the presence of a human trust that only may come to a people with broadening humanity, widening human love for one's fellows. And if God is love, as the prophets say, then love is God, and this growing abnegation of self to democracy is a divinely implanted instinct—one with the miracles of life about us" (The Old Order Changeth, pp. 30, 63).

CHAPTER IX

WEALTH AND WELFARE

"THERE is no wealth but life," John Ruskin says, "life, including all its powers of love, of joy, of admiration. That country is richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings; that man is richest who, having perfected the functions of his own life to the utmost, has also the widest helpful influence, both personal and, by means of his possessions, over the lives of others." Ruskin's social teachings used to be scorned as visionary and impracticable, but the world is coming to see that the only wealth which can satisfy human needs and really enrich society is "the wealth of life—life including all its powers of love, of joy, and admiration." A greater than Ruskin—Jesus Christ—has declared that "the life is more than meat, and the body than raiment. A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

In nothing is Jesus Christ's perfect

sanity and imperial wisdom more fully shown than in his attitude toward wealth and wealthy persons. He never made any criticism upon wealth and the expenditure of large sums of money. He did not chide Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathæa because they were rich. Some of his disciples owned their boats and fishing-gear and were virtually capitalists. But Jesus showed a friendly interest in them and in their business. The home at Bethany, which Jesus loved above all others to visit, was a home of comfort, if not of luxury.

On the other hand, no one was ever so mindful of the needs of the poor or more desirous to devote wealth to their help than Jesus. He said to the young ruler, "Sell all thou hast and give to the poor." But why did Jesus demand the giving up of the young ruler's wealth and allow Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæa to enjoy theirs? Because the life of this young man was bound up in his money. He had money, and money had him. Wealth was only a by-product with the others.

Jesus did not condemn the putting of so much money into the temple at Jerusalem. It was a magnificent edifice. "It was a marvel to the world for its costly mosaics, its fragrant woods, its glittering roof, the golden vine with hanging clusters sculptured over the entrance door, the embroidered veils enwoven with flowers of purple, the profuse magnificence of its silver, gold, and precious stones." The temple was not too rich and magnificent. Jesus would have been a contented worshiper there if it had been filled with the presence of the Lord, and with the worship of a grateful, reverent people.

The erection of costly churches in our day is often condemned as a wicked extravagance, and contrary to the simplicity of the gospel. But it is no misappropriation of wealth to build beautiful structures, which shall nobly proclaim to the world the Christian faith and be used for years as places of worship. Religion should be at least as worthily housed as commerce. Souls deserve grander meeting-places than commodities. Religion and beauty are the great crying needs of

human nature. Religion binds us to worship and worship binds us to God; it enthrones the spiritual and the eternal above the transient and the sordid. Man needs stimulants which nourish and do not dissipate, which bring simple and sustained joyfulness instead of wasting pleasures, and amid all the surge and spray of passing events assure him of an everlasting habitation. Millet's "The Angelus" portrays how the call to prayer ennobles the humblest toiler. John Bethune, a Scottish worker breaking stones on the parish road, found a like refreshment for his soul as he gazed upon a glorious sunset and exclaimed:

"Hail, hallowed evening! sacred hour to me.
Thy clouds of gray, thy vocal melody
Oft to me have brought relief from toil to peaceful thought.
How oft my eyes, wearied with their long gaze on drudgery,
Looked up and found refreshment in the hues
That gild thy vest with coloring profuse!"

No good cause suffers because of the money spent to bring home to the people the inspiration and consolation of religion

and the beauty of nature and art. Humanity is always enriched by such ministries. Lives which otherwise might be base, ugly, and sordid become reverent, beautiful, and spiritual.

It is very difficult to draw the line where the Christian use of wealth ends and its wrong use begins. Sin and luxury have always walked hand in hand, but not all luxury is sin. Luxury is a relative matter. What seems like superfluity for one person may be only necessary expense for another. People generally consider those things to be superfluous which they do not habitually use. These are different in different ages. Holinshed, the old English chronicler, lamented that in his time —in the sixteenth century—some luxurious persons were introducing chimneys into their dwellings instead of allowing the smoke to escape through cracks in the roof, and were using vessels of earthenware, or even of tin, in place of the old wooden bowls and jugs. According to that standard, nearly everybody to-day lives luxuriously. Sir Walter Scott in one of his stories tells of a Highlander

who, sleeping on an open moor in the dead of winter, rolled up a ball of snow for a pillow. His companions at once kicked it away as a sign of effeminacy. But now a person may sleep on a hair mattress and not be regarded effeminate. The line between luxuries and necessities is constantly shifting. The luxuries of one age become the common comforts of the next.

"A rich old lady was once persuaded by a zealous evangelistic curate to renounce the world. She sold her house, she scattered her establishment; she settled herself in a cheap lodging and invited the curate to tea. He came. The meal was of the simplest, but the spoons were silver. The curate, young and consistent, remonstrated, and demanded that the spoons be sold and the price given to the Lord. But the social conscience of the parishioner had been strained to the breaking point. To eat with pewter was more than she could bear. The curate had gone too far and had ruined his cause. The rich old lady, willing, since sin she must, to sin with comfort, bought back her house

and her horses, reassembled her servants, and returned to all her worldly ways." There are few persons to-day who have not their silver spoons.

The wrong use of wealth is determined not by the sum that we spend but by the spirit that we carry into our expenditure. Luxurious sinfulness always has its root in vanity or some form of selfish indulgence. Many articles of dress are worn not simply because they are becoming, but because of what they cost. Houses are built, grounds are laid out, equipage and clothing are often provided in amplitude not only far beyond the owner's need but for the purpose of display. They are signs of barren wealth or surplus money. As such they flatter the owner's pride. The thing that is luxurious and should be condemned in dress, in homes, in pleasures is the love of display, the desire to surpass others. Every heart that harbors such a spirit knows it. There is no perplexity about it. It is for each person to determine and settle with his own conscience what expenditure tends to make him live in what is material and sensual, and what

ministers to his true culture and his higher life. There is no mistaking the fact that much of the ostentation and lavish use of wealth, much of the self-indulgence which we see all about us is wanton and wicked. It is utterly inconsistent with the simplicity which should distinguish the Christian, and is a prolific source of sensuality and social corruption. Luxurious living is enervating and corrupting. It enfeebles the soul by stimulating desires for mere pleasure and frivolity. It benumbs the spirit of self-sacrifice, without which no human being or society can be morally healthy or sound. When men and women live for selfish gratification, public spirit dies in them; so do philanthropy and religion.

Many members of Christian churches accumulate wealth mainly for themselves or their families. Covetousness, which so degrades man's noblest powers and corrupts society, which divides men into warring classes, curses Christian churches and paralyzes their spiritual activity. Rich men are often exalted because of their wealth alone, and in the councils of the church, as in business, these men by the

mere might of their money exercise a dominating influence.

"Ye cannot serve God and mammon," Christ says. What is it to serve mammon in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fourteen? It is the strong will and determined effort to be rich, well-placed, and amused, with a feeble, starveling effort to know God's truth and help one's fellow men. This is to serve mammon. This is what Christ condemns, and this, when covered with a mask of a Christian profession, the world despises. The world knows too much of Christ not to detect the counterfeit. Is this luxurious living in the presence of moaning want, "this withholding more than is meet" in service and money, when all forms of evangelistic and philanthropic activity are crippled for lack of support—is this bowing down to the seen and perishable, Christian?

The parable of Dives is a true picture of a portion of human society to-day. It portrays the inevitable separation and retribution that is experienced by those who live in luxury and isolate themselves from the miseries of humanity.

The soul shrinks and hardens; discontent and torment follow when temporal and eternal values are discerned in their true relation. When the day of judgment and kindling vision came to Dives he saw all the scenes and events of his past life stand out clear and distinct—the old palace where he used to feast with his five brothers, the magnificent court and lawn, and out there at the gate Lazarus and the dogs. Dives had not been a bad man, but he had not been good; he had lived for himself and not for others; the world was no better for his having lived in it; he had squandered the splendid privilege of life. This thought torments him. And, lo! as he lifts up his eyes to heaven he beholds Abraham with Lazarus in his bosom and separated by a great gulf. There had always been a great gulf between Dives and Lazarus. Dives had always been charitable, and doubtless, like most Pharisees, had many virtues. He always gave the leavings of his table to Lazarus and the dogs. But in all those years Dives had never spoken to the beggar. Lazarus lay there in his

deformity and pain, a companion of the dogs. Dives took him and his beggary for granted; he shut up his house and his heart against suffering humanity. Now in the clear light of eternity he sees this gulf in its true character. The soul of Dives, by his pride and hardness of heart, had been shrinking and shutting himself away from paradise, while the soul of Lazarus, by his humility, had been expanding and drawing nearer to heaven. Dives could have crossed that gulf when on earth so easily. By seeking the poor and the lost, as Christ did, Dives could have realized his kinship with his fellow men, the poor and unfortunate as well as with the rich, and then he would have gone into the other world with a different kind of soul, and there would have been no gulf of separation.

Dives himself has made the gulf. He saw it projected upon the screen of eternity and the awful consequences of his own acts revealed in their terrible reality. The gulf, which he had deliberately established between himself and his brother man on earth, had become the means of his punishment.

Now he has the want and misery, and Lazarus has the satisfaction and felicity. Dives is in torment; and the torment is his own memory combining with his own restless desires, panting within him like beasts of prey in a cage, but with no means of satisfaction. Like the dogs at his palace gate, he sees a vision of plenty and happiness; he sees the City of God with its throngs of men and women, whose serene faces speak of spiritual conquest and blessedness. But how can he, the ignorant, the proud, the selfish one, cross to them, the wise, the humble, the loving? Even if by the aid of some supernatural power he could be lifted into heaven, how could he speak their language or enjoy their companionship? How could he, who had never known anything but sumptuous living, the gratification of his every appetite, enter into the joy of those "who came out of great tribulation with their robes washed in the blood of the Lamb"? The gulf was not so wide but that Dives could see across it, but it was deep; it was built up out of the choices he had made in his early life and per-

sistently maintained throughout all the years of his luxurious living.

The severest condemnations of luxury are not to be found in the Bible, but in the statements of hard-headed political economists. It is political economy which asks: When labor is so necessary to procure for mankind the satisfaction of its legitimate needs, and so many thousands in every city are compelled to live in destitution, is it right to devote so much capital and labor to the production of superfluities for the few, when in many cases these few persons would better be without them? Is not such extravagance a waste, which is a crime against society?

Laveleye, a great economist, says: "Would any man be insane enough to devote three years of his existence to making himself a piece of jewelry which in point of fact will be of no real use to him? It is the phenomena of exchange which hide from us the real absurdity of it—the fact that he or she who wears it has ordered it from some one else. We do not see how much labor it has cost which should have been devoted to other

uses. When we consider the whole of humanity as one being, obliged to satisfy his wants by his labor, we can see clearly that it is folly for him to waste precious time in cutting diamonds if he still has often to walk with bare feet. The inhabitants of any country have but a certain number of hours in the day to dispose of; if they devote a part of this time to making useless trifles, it is inevitable that a part of the population should go without the necessaries of life." An emperor of China once said, "If one of my subjects is idle and does not work, then there is somewhere in my state another who suffers from hunger and cold." This emperor of China was a good political economist. If all the Chinese emperors had been as wise and as sympathetic as he, China would never have had a revolution.

This subject is one which should concern not the idle or the industrious rich alone, but it should come home for prayerful consideration to us all. How much have we a right to spend upon the comforts and pleasures of life? It is very evident that the answer to this question

depends not upon the size of our income or upon our wants and wishes. Conscience should rule here as in our religious and moral activities. Every indulgence in luxury or amusement which we allow, every use we make of money or leisure, for rest, for travel, for the accumulation of the means of personal gratification, should satisfy these tests: First, it should minister directly or indirectly to our higher development and greater efficiency. Secondly, it should not foster the feeling of vanity in ourselves, or be so ostentatious as to influence envy in others. Thirdly, it should not add to the burdens of society. Aristotle, twenty-two hundred years ago, defined property "as a collection of implements for the purposes of life." That wise old Greek pointed out the true use of wealth. It is to be employed, not to pamper or enervate us, but to expand and ennoble our powers. Money, like any other gift—like knowledge, like beauty—may feed our vanity or it may enrich our soul.

Here is a man who has thought of nothing but business, and the getting of

money. He has succeeded, but he has nothing but money. He is proud of it and takes delight in impressing upon the world the fact of his one possession, his wealth. He is himself a fraction of a man. He has no store of knowledge, no wide-reaching aspirations or sympathies, no resources with which to bear the burdens and ills of life.

Here is another man. He, too, has money; and as fast as he got it he built avenues of communication to the world's treasures of knowledge and art, avenues, too, of living sympathy with the institutions of religion, education, and philanthropy. He has identified himself with noble causes and walked hand in hand with needy people. Thus he has expanded and enriched his nature. Now, suppose both of these men lose their money. What will there be left in each case? The first man will, indeed, lose all that he has; he is truly a ruined man. He is of no more value than an empty moneybag. But the other man keeps his noble mind, his loving heart, his rich nature, and a score of other valuable assets in the pro-

ductive enterprises he has helped to maintain. He has a house eternal in the heavens. He has become essentially rich. He has investments in knowledge, in faith, in fellowship, in good works, which will always pay dividends. When all else fails there are everlasting habitations into which he will be received, and the joy of the Lord will be his forever.

We have no right to spend money as we please; we have a right to spend it only as we *ought*. In our expenditures, as in everything else, we stand in a threefold relation—our relation to God, our relation to our higher self, and our relation to our neighbor. We have duties in these three directions. The only possessions that we can call ours are our moral, mental, and physical powers, and these should be under the authority of conscience. There are causes all about us, which are dear to the heart of God and bound up in the welfare of humanity, that are suffering for the lack of proper support. How much have we a right to spend upon ourselves when some of these precious ministries are bleeding to

death? The American people pay for confectionery, soft drinks, and chewing gum seventy-one million dollars more every year than they pay for church work and foreign missions. They spend ten times as much for tobacco and liquor as they do for the support of the churches, and most churches face a deficiency at the end of every year. Many persons cry out against an income tax, and yet the American people tax themselves eight billion dollars a year for eight luxuries which do them vastly more harm than good.

In our expenditures we often forget that we all, the rich and the poor, are members of one great human family. In a well-ordered household it would be considered monstrous and brutal if the father or mother or one of the children should spend so much of the common patrimony in selfish gratification that the rest of the family should suffer for the necessities of life. If a company of people should be gathered together at a banquet where the provision was barely sufficient to give each a moderate share, and a few greedy persons should help themselves so plenti-

fully that there would not be enough left for the others, these greedy persons would be regarded as boors. But in every city there are hundreds of idle rich, *idle* rich, who produce nothing, but consume and waste so much from life's common table that only a few crumbs are left for the thousands who are continually on the verge of starvation.

Professor Cairnes, one of the most conservative political economists of England, speaking of the abundant expenditures of the idle rich, says: "The wealth accumulated by their ancestors or others on their behalf, when it is employed as capital in productive enterprises, no doubt helps to sustain industry. But what they consume in luxury and idleness is not capital, and helps sustain nothing but their own unprofitable lives. By all means they must have their rents and interest as it is written in the bond; but let them take their proper place as drones in the hive, gorging at a feast to which they have contributed nothing. This does not apply to the industrious rich, but it does condemn their luxury."

CHAPTER X

THE CHURCH AND HER CRITICS

In the Delineator, that big, popular periodical devoted to the fashion of dress, there was published a few years ago a symposium upon the subject, "What Is the Matter with the Church?" The enterprising editor of that magazine evidently thought that religion is a live topic and that his readers would turn aside from the fascination of feminine attire to consider the condition and prospects of the Christian Church.

In his letter, sent out to eleven leading representatives of the church in this country, including Cardinal Gibbons and Rabbi Hirsch, the editor writes "of an impression that has gone abroad and is prevalent among non-church members that the church is dying; that it is not making effective use of the property, buildings, and organizations which are already in its hands; that interdenominational disputes stand in the way of a reasonably united effort for

worthy sociologic and humanitarian causes; that the church does not understand the drift of the times; that intelligent and capable youth are not being drawn into the ministry; that men of weight in the world cannot be induced to attend its services; that the real needs and spiritual wants of the people are misunderstood and neglected."

It was a serious indictment that this editor brought before those prominent religious leaders. It was an admirable summary of opinions that are expressed to-day both within and without church circles.

It must be conceded that this indictment in some of its counts is true. The church does fall below her lofty ideals, and is not so efficient as she should be; the maintenance of so many denominations is too expensive and has a tendency to divert the church from her real mission; she does not measure up to the tremendous responsibilities that are laid upon her, or make full use of the many opportunities for the regeneration of society that are continually opening before her.

It must also be admitted that there is a drift away from the sanctuary. In every town and city many persons stay away from church services. The causes are various—religious indifference and unbelief, physical and mental exhaustion after a week of toil, the desire for recreation on the only free day of the week, unwillingness to contribute to church expenses on the part of those who prefer to spend the money for other things, or who are struggling to make both ends meet. There is also a great deal of sentiment of a materialistic sort and a widespread feeling among wage-earners that the church is on the side of capital in the great class struggle, whose lines are every year becoming more sharply defined.

The church is essentially "a habitation of God through the Spirit," but its outward form and character are determined by what the people make it by the help of divine grace or through their indifference and worldly conformity allow it to become. Human nature is a peculiar mixture and is in a state of perpetual change. Goodness, like gold, has its alloys

and these, while they help give it currency, debase it. The church, in its earthly embodiment, is never perfect and conforms more or less to the imperfect society it seeks to transform.

This age is only nominally Christian. Its spiritual heritage has been wasted and desecrated as truly as the natural resources of the country have been. Guizot says that "in all countries, in all times, whatever the political system may be, at a longer or shorter interval as a simple result of the enjoyment and power of riches, the upper classes become worn out and enervated." The tendency which Guizot points out is writ large in history. The deformation of certain families through selfishness and pride is unmistakable. The lip of the Hapsburgs, the nose of the Bourbons, and the ugliness of the Spanish grandees are proverbial. Similar evidences of degeneracy may already be seen in certain American families, notably those who have come into possession of "swollen fortunes" by inheritance and who squander their leisure in luxurious idleness. The law of diminishing returns, by which land,

losing its fertility, returns less in proportion to what is expended upon it, operates also in man.

Man, like the soil, becomes impoverished unless perpetually enriched and kept efficient and productive. When the energy, the thrift, and the courage imparted by the struggle against hardship and by the desire for wealth are no longer necessary; when fortunes increase almost without effort and by various forms of unearned increment; when the sole concern in life is for the barren use of money and for the wasting pleasures which money makes possible, the nobler qualities die out and all sorts of sordid perversions take their place.

If the evils of this degeneracy were confined to the rich, the harm to the community would not be so great; but the blazonry of such luxury, the glitter of such false standards in life, the wanton waste of a common patrimony, while so many about them are in such sore needs, poisons and embitters those lower down in the social scale. These classes of people—those who have riches and are corrupted

by them; those who are consumed by a feverish desire to get them; and those who are benumbed by want and wretchedness—are very difficult to reach by religious ministries.

Furthermore, in these days of prodigious materialistic activities and glittering rewards, it is only by a great struggle that the supremacy of the nobler qualities is maintained in the soul, and love for the fruits of the Spirit is preserved.

The school and the state are passing through the same period of "storm and stress." Educators complain of the growing lack of seriousness among their pupils and confess that the results are not at all commensurate with the immense expenditure in endowment and equipment. Vocational studies are crowding the cultural studies into narrower quarters. The old idealism from which the noble spirits in church and state in the past derived their sustenance has been supplanted by the "bread-and-butter" sciences.

The obstacles which the church encounters in carrying out her peculiar mission are much the same as those that

democracy meets in accomplishing its tasks. An ideal democracy is one in which every man in public office is intelligent, patriotic, and conscientious. But no such democracy is now embodied in human affairs. The best men in the community are not, as a rule, elected to public office. The man of large brain and noble spirit, if he venture into the political arena, is often elbowed aside by a more aggressive man who is unscrupulous and more successful in the rough-and-tumble of politics.

Democracy is being as severely criticized as the church. The Dean of Saint Paul's in London says: "Democracy is perhaps the silliest of all fetishes that are seriously worshiped among us. The method of counting heads, instead of breaking them, is no doubt a rough-and-ready test of strength. To talk to the average member of Parliament, one might suppose that the ballot box was a sort of Urim and Thummim for ascertaining the divine will. This superstition is merely our old friend, the divine right of kings, standing on its head; and it is even more ridiculous in that posture than in its original attitude.

There is absolutely no guarantee in the nature of things that the decision of the majority will be either wise or just; and what is neither wise nor just ought not to be done."

Democracy in its best estate certainly is not "a fetish," but the sublime organized effort of the people to establish a saner sovereignty, a better social order, in a world full of greed and groveling tendencies.

The church, like democracy, falls below its ideals. It is "a light shining in darkness." The predatory lusts which pamper the few and pauperize the many still remain to be scourged out of Christian temples; the slums, where poor, bedraggled humanity is sinking deeper and deeper in wretchedness, are a standing rebuke to the elegant churches and luxurious homes of Christian people who every Sunday morning pray, "Thy kingdom come; give us this day our daily bread." The Christian Church, on its march to establish the kingdom of God, is far from being "a compact, well-drilled, disciplined body." Where it moves forward, its march has

been compared by the Outlook to that of "the children of Israel, confused, wavering, and halting. It learns how to march by marching. Yet nothing is more certain than its slow, hesitating advance; and once advanced, it intrenches itself more strongly in its positions than any other force on earth. Moreover, it is the van of the Christian Church which helps to lead every sociological movement to-day. More than three fourths of all social workers in America at this moment are members of Christian churches. The ethical societies, the atheistic societies, the lapsed church members, are not one fourth of the whole, by the latest statistical account. Take away the men and women whom the church has set aflame with her ideals of brotherhood and self-sacrifice, and every charitable work in America would be crippled to-morrow. The van of the church is pushing ahead eagerly toward industrial arbitration, municipal reform, temperance legislation, improved housing for the poor, the protection of women and children industrially, old-age pensions, and every reform that America is con-

sidering. It is an undenominational van, shoulder to shoulder, representing no one church, appealing to no ecclesiastical authority. Then the great power that helps ahead all reforms—the power of money to help others and advance the coming day—comes, more than four fifths of it, from church people, not given through their churches, but as individuals. The church more than any other institution trains givers, it trains them to rejoice in giving. Take away the gifts of Christian men and women toward the needs of others, and hospital and kindergarten, settlement and university would collapse in wreck."

To what organization is humanity looking so confidently for leadership in establishing a better social order as to the Christian Church? A prominent Chicago attorney is quoted as saying: "At our club, every day, I hear politicians and business men talking of public corruption in the city, and over and over they keep asking, 'What are the churches going to do about it?' They are waiting for the churches to lead off." The Chicago In-

terior, commenting upon this lawyer's remark, says, "The world has come to expect of the church leadership in the destruction of civil evils. . . . The reward of what little the church has already done for civic and social reform is this—it is expected to do more. . . . The reason for this expectancy is that the church has something in it which lasts. The worst defeat of reform in the cities and towns has always been that the reforming determination oozes out so quickly. Civic societies are organized and go in for a while with mighty vim. But soon leaders and followers together are tired of the trouble; they quietly drop out and slink away. The organization goes to pieces and the rascals come back. But the church hasn't gone to pieces yet. It has outlasted every strain that has come on it. It sags sometimes but it always recovers itself. If the church once gets roused enough to set its sentinels out, the foe won't slip back into the old stronghold unobserved. The fighting army will never be quite depleted; a nucleus at least will always be under drill."

Lloyd George, the English statesman, who is battling so successfully against the oppressions that have so long been crushing the lives and liberties of the English people, said recently: "The churches of Christ in this land guide, control, and direct the consciences of the community; they establish the moral standards which fix the ideals of the people; they direct affairs not merely in the Senate and in the council chamber, but in the shop and the factory and in all the affairs of life. No interest, however powerful it may be, can long withstand the resolute, united opposition of the churches. Public opinion in this land invariably responds to the call of the united churches. As their power is great, so is their responsibility."

Some persons contend that the sphere of the church should be restricted to her spiritual ministry, and that she does her whole duty when she holds up Christian ideals and imbues her members with the Christian spirit. Forsythe, in his book, Socialism and the Poor, says: "The church has not to solve the social prob-

lem, but to provide the men, the principles, and the public that can. It is not a program, but a spirit, a moral habit that the church has above all things to bring to pass. It has to bring to pass the faith and rule of Christ. Its first object is not the social state but the social soul, meaning by that the Godly soul with its social love and serviceable feeling. For the church to identify itself wholly as a church with a social program, which is the order of the day, is contrary to its genius and commission." But Mr. Hobson, in his essay, "A Modern Outlook," pertinently asks: "Can a church assist in making principles and men capable of social service without taking a direct part in testing, determining, and molding the very forms of social service? If a minister of Christ's Church is living in rack-rented, slum dwellings, sees all around the ruins wrought by drink, gambling, prostitution, and the organic connection between all these shapes of personal vice and misery and the abuses of property, must he not as a duty of his sacred office denounce these evils in their political as well as

their moral bearing, and ally himself and his church with whatever organization seems to him effective for their remedy? Yet such a course, if it be pursued, may carry him far into policies and even programs of political and social reform. How far? Must he endanger the quieter, deeper, more abiding influences of his office by partisanship in the heated struggles between rival interests, breaking heads with his mates even if he may not hew limbs with his sword?"

Nothing that vitally concerns humanity is outside the sphere of the church's responsibility. The religious and the economic activities of man are like two spheres which cut and interpenetrate each other. Both are essential and contribute mightily to human welfare. Professor Marshall, in his monumental work upon economics, showing the close relation between the Protestant Reformation and the industrial revolution in England, says: "The natural gravity and intrepidity of the stern races that had settled on the shores of England inclined them to embrace the doctrines of the Reformation; and these reacted on

their habits of life, and gave a tone to their industry. Man was, as it were, ushered straight into the presence of God, with no human intermediary; life became intense and full of awe; and now for the first time large numbers of rude and uncultured people yearned toward the mysteries of absolute spiritual freedom" (Vol. I, p. 34). The consciousness of spiritual freedom gave a tremendous impulse toward political freedom. "The same qualities which gave them political freedom gave them also free enterprise in industry and commerce." The Factory Acts legislation of the nineteenth century, with its merciful provisions, never could have been passed had not the Wesleyan Revival stirred the conscience and softened the heart of England.

When Wesley and Whitefield came preaching the glorious gospel of the Son of God, proclaiming a common Father and the coming of a kingdom of perfect righteousness in which all men should be brothers, men and women were laboring blindly and blankly as brute beasts labor, down in the coal mines, in factories, in

dank fields, on barren, remote moors; they were working from fourteen to sixteen hours a day, in surroundings that were fatal to health and morals; their lot was one of helpless and hopeless drudgery; for them came no glimpse of a wider and more joyful life; theirs was a starved and benumbed existence. But under the preaching of Wesley, the deep, hidden sensibilities of those poor, despairing laborers were quickened, their blind souls were filled with lofty and divine visions. They studied the gospel, they became convinced of a divine destiny, and it gave them aspirations and the consciousness of power. They began to know more and do more; a new expanding life stirred within them; they began to agitate against those oppressions of greed which were hindering their development. The movement for their elevation had begun, and that movement has been rising and broadening ever since.

Green, in his History of the English People, has described how this rising, broadening feeling of social responsibility spread far beyond the church, rose superior to

class interests, and by means of the Factory Acts worked mightily for industrial amelioration. In 1815, for example, "oppression, corruption, and injustice were omnipresent and apparently impregnable. The aristocracy, the officers of the nation and of the municipalities, the owners of estates, gave the law to England, and the idea of sharing their powers and rewards with the common people never entered their minds. Nor would they ever have admitted it, had the appeal been simply on the ground of abstract right, for popular government seemed to them the same as anarchy. But the abuses resulted in national calamities which affected the rich as well as the poor—and slowly, against their will and fighting for every step, the upper classes conceded point after point to the proletariat."

The social amelioration which Green describes as beginning in 1815 was carried through the entire century. John Morley declares that the championship by Bright and Cobden of the people against the colossal forms of selfishness "had about it something of the apostolic. Those

two plain men, who became orators because they had something to say, left their homes and their business and went over the land to convert the nation as to a new religion." John Bright in one of his speeches reveals the noble spirit with which he entered upon this work of social redemption. "I was in Leamington, and Mr. Cobden called upon me. I was then in the depths of grief—I may almost say of despair—for the light and sunshine of my house had been extinguished. All that was left on earth of my young wife, except the memory of a sainted life and a too-brief happiness, was lying still and cold in the chamber above us. Mr. Cobden called upon me as his friend, and addressed me, as you may suppose, with words of condolence. After a time he looked up and said: 'There are thousands and thousands of homes in England at this moment where wives and mothers and children are dying of hunger. Now, when the first paroxysm of your grief is passed, I would advise you to come with me, and we will never rest until the Corn Laws are repealed.' "

CHAPTER XI

THE CHURCHES AND CHRIST'S KINGDOM

The Christian Church has been too unresponsive to the supreme claims of Christ's kingdom. It has been torn asunder and split into divers sects over doctrines of salvation and ceremonial usages. But its divine mission always has been and is now to enthrone Christ's authority over all the activities of mankind and bring about a reconstruction of society, social and economic as well as spiritual, in harmony with the principles of his gospel.

Miss Vida Scudder, in her very able book, Socialism and Character, says: "How impoverished, how partial, the ideas most operative in Christian history appear when placed beside the rich ideals of the kingdom of heaven as it lay in the mind of Jesus! Economic expansion and racial progress have at last in the fullness of time brought us to the point where we may recover that ideal, if we will. Behind us lie the

great doctrinal age, the great liturgical age, and the age preoccupied with personal religion. . . . But doctrine, liturgy, personal religion must now be supplemented and sustained by a large social conception of a regenerate humanity. . . . The unlovely, unchristian aspects of modern life mean only that the disease and evil which contradict the divine will have worked their way out from the social depths where they can be seen and fought. To-day the Christian experiment confronts a better chance of victory than at any time since the days when its superb exaltation of humility converted the Roman empire. It may be that in the long run the religion of Jesus will survive only if it embraces this opportunity, and by infusing a soul into the body of Socialism transforms the rising Social Democracy from 'the coming slavery' to the likeness of the free city of the Great King" (pp. 398-400).

Christianity always grows most rapidly and does her best work when she exalts the Christ and mobilizes her forces around her Living Head. Nothing will so effectually rally the scattered divisions of Chris-

tendom and make them march in mutual, well-beseeming ranks all one way against the inveterate enemies of mankind as the common determination to enthrone Christ above all denominational loyalties and carry on the work that he began—"to seek and save the lost."

There are wise dogmas, beautiful theories, and fond hopes of human betterment in abundance, but, to use Wordsworth's lines, these

> Want due consistence; like a pillar of smoke
> That with majestic energy from earth
> Rises, but, having reached the thinner air,
> Melts and dissolves, and is no longer seen.

Christ is sorely needed to give consistency and enduring vitality to man's best beliefs and hopes—with his human touch to make God real and "justify his ways to man"—in a civilization so selfish and unjust as this.

There is no system or method of economic distribution which covetous men could not manipulate so as to get more than their just share. The industrial struggle is not so much between capital and labor, or between capitalism and Socialism, as

it is between greed and good will. These forces do not follow the lines of cleavage made by any economic distinctions. They contend for the mastery within labor unions as truly as within corporations, and often disrupt both. Every class in society is crying out for its rights and is more or less selfish in its demands. These antagonistic demands can never be polarized and harmonized by any mere regulative enactments or reforms, without the cooperation of certain unifying, transforming beliefs and emotions. Nothing can impart these with such fullness and power as the belief in the Divine Ruler of the universe and the Judge of humanity. In this uplifting, unifying faith, all rights and all possessions are beheld coming down from God, the infinite Giver, "by whom are all things, and for whom are all things." Wherever this belief has sway, power and property rights yield to the common good.[1]

[1] Maurice says: "The apostles did not find it possible to think of human society except as constituted in Christ. It was the confusion, the unbelief of men, to regard themselves as capable of fellowship and existence without him. It was theirs to proclaim that there could have been no families, no nation to resist the selfish tendencies which each of us is conscious of in himself and complains of in his neighbors, if there had not been one living center of the whole humanity, one head of every man."

Only when Christ commands the heart of the church and democracy will religion, education, and commerce do their perfect work. He alone can save the soul of society and make it dominate all lower masteries. The mechanical triumphs and comforts of which we are so proud have smoothed only the surface of life; the competitive struggle has been intensified, industry has become a battlefield, and preparations for war are on a more oppressive and destructive scale than ever before. If the material benefits of civilization should be increased a hundredfold, the millions down at the base of the social pyramid will not be permanently bettered, unless the Christ spirit of human brotherhood take possession of society. Magnificent churches, elegant homes are being multiplied, but the moan of the vanquished, the cry of the children is continually coming up out of a hell of degradation and suffering which is steadily widening and deepening.

It has been well said that "beautiful stability always means standing under the pressure of some splendid mastery. It

takes two things to complete the beauty of this world of ours: it takes warm sunshine, what we might call the sun's love of the world, the sun's heart-throb, making its heat felt among all objects lying under the fervid sky, among all creatures moving through the genial atmosphere; and it takes also the very strictest kind of submission—submission absolute and unvarying on the part of everything in nature, all the way from star to atom" (Dr. Charles Parkhurst).

In our recent national history we have had most impressive examples of the blessedness that comes from the submission of sectional and party antagonism to a higher mastery. In the late war with Spain men of various trades and professions turned away from their occupations in obedience to their country's call. Men from the North and men from the South, who had fought against one another in the Civil War, stifled their animosities and marched shoulder to shoulder under a common flag against a common enemy. Then there began in this country a larger and a truer national life; we began to

feel that we were no longer Northerners and Southerners, but one people, with a noble mission. Since then, we have grown in dignity and power. We have larger aims and interests. We demand of our public servants a higher and broader statesmanship. Political practices which were once respectable are now reprobated by both parties. Political issues are now more concerned with the welfare of the whole people. The power of the government is being brought to bear upon the predatory forces which have invaded our industrial and political life. We are turning on the light, we are cleaning house. The old party idolatry is passing and new alignments are being made to suit the larger demands of our expanding national life.

A similar broadening and purifying change is taking place in our church life. This is especially manifest as we obey the call of Christ and work together as Christians in missionary and philanthropic work. It is a significant fact that as Christians have carried the gospel down to the slums of our cities, or as they

have worked side by side amid the perils of mission fields, they have learned really to love one another and join in a fellowship of prayer and service which no rivalry can destroy. Then, too, the people of the Orient insist more and more upon their right to accept Christ without the artificial and ecclesiastical admixtures of Occidental Christianity. They will help us throw off some of these accretions of twenty centuries and recover a simpler, purer, and diviner faith. In obeying Christ's commands to seek and save the lost we best learn what his religion is—what is essential and what is non-essential.

With an ever-changing world and the needs of humanity ever expanding, the Christian Church must constantly make new alignments and institute new methods. Years ago the English War Department was considering a change of uniform. The Duke of Wellington, thinking that he would get an opinion of an old soldier, asked: "If you were to fight the battle of Waterloo over again, what kind of a uniform would you like to wear?" Quick

as a flash came the reply from the scarred veteran: "General, if I were going to fight it over again, I should want to go in my shirt sleeves." We must throw away some of our sectarian baggage and ecclesiastical millinery and "put on Christ." It is through him, and through him alone, that we can conquer a world as complex and as wicked as ours.

The energies of the Christian churches are altogether too much expended in caring for their ecclesiastical preserves, coddling the well-to-do, and trying to keep them from being lost rather than in seeking that great multitude who are scattered abroad like sheep having no shepherd. These receive only a few crumbs of service after all other interests are cared for, just as Lazarus did from the rich man's table. Some day they, like him, may be comforted and we tormented. God is not blessing this self-centered propaganda. The returns from our present denominational investments and activities are scarcely respectable. Furthermore, there are often so many competing churches in the same neighborhood, in cities and

in small towns, that they are cheapened and compromised by the huckstering methods to which they resort to raise money to meet current expenses.

There is a universal demand among the nations to avert the horrors of war and to lighten the burdens which are crushing out the lives of the people. There is a still greater necessity for stopping this ruinous denominational competition and enlisting the churches in a holy crusade to uplift those abandoned masses upon whose salvation the very stability and welfare of society depend. The tremendous power of the dangerous forces at work outside all church ministration is very dimly perceived. The social earthquakes of the last few years have made the whole structure of society tremble. Such outbreaks are always imminent so long as the present bitterness rankles in the breasts of those who have received only the scraps at life's great feast. Syndicalism is everywhere with its agitators stirring up the discontented and rallying them for "the general strike," which means the seizure of the industries and resources of society.

Mr. R. Fulton Cutting, founder of the Bureau of Municipal Research, president of the New York Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor, says: "There are one hundred thousand needless infant deaths in a year in this country, nearly two million child laborers, millions of school children, handicapped by easily removable physical defects; fifty thousand five hundred tenement-house rooms totally without windows in New York city alone, and two hundred and eighteen thousand one hundred and forty-seven churches with a membership of more than thirty-five millions and church property valued at over a billion and a quarter. *Is there any relation between these statistics?*" After correspondence and interviews with two hundred and twenty-seven ministers and religious organizations in one hundred and thirty-seven cities Mr. Cutting concludes that the social betterment of the race needs a stronger union of church and state than this country has had since it became a republic. As a molder of public opinion, Mr. Cutting believes the church to be "almost irre-

sistible" whenever she "exerts her influence intelligently." "She is now classed as a reactionary, not because she really is such, but because her want of cohesion and unanimity of purpose paralyzes her faculty of expression, and her silence is misinterpreted. If she could learn to speak with one mind and one voice, and take her stand for the right in great public issues that are not complicated by partisanship, she would render great service to civilization."

The bond which more than any other holds society together is the good will expressed by the community in Christian evangelism, humane legislation, and the various forms of moral and economic helpfulness. Luther used to say, "Accept the civil situation and may God mend all." "Nay," replied Calvin, "we must help him mend all." In like manner John Wesley declared: "We are the servants of the community. We are in the communal life to redeem it by service and by any and all service that we can render." The crying need of Christendom to-day is for more men of administrative ability

and burning passion for humanity to mobilize our churches for the moral and spiritual betterment of those to whom Christ, if he were on the earth, would minister first of all. What a transformation there would be in church enterprises and methods if, like him, we put first things first!

Every denomination in every city has a large amount of property in churches whose commercial value is great but whose spiritual usefulness has gone. There they remain year after year wasting the precious resources which should be devoted to the Master's use, their very existence crippling other neighboring churches. There is no effort commensurate with the opportunity to reach the submerged classes about them, and what is done is presented in that narrow sectarian fashion which experience has again and again demonstrated to be ineffectual. Meanwhile money is lavished in expensive churches and equipment in the better residential districts, where the people are well-nigh surfeited with religious and social privileges.

The strength and glory of the Christian

Church in the early centuries came mainly from its ministries to the neglected proletariat. Later, in the Middle Ages, as Hyndman in his book, The Historical Basis of Socialism in England, says: "At a time when the sufferings of the lower classes were profound and irremedial, the Catholic Church alone opened her arms to all, and made it possible for the sons of the humblest laborers to rise even to the highest grades of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Nor must we forget the action of the monasteries, which almost everywhere contributed to render the lot of the poor less intolerable. Every convent had its own poor, to which it supplied daily food. The relations of the church, the monasteries, and the clergy to the people were most important from every point of view. There is nothing more noteworthy in the history of the human mind than the manner in which this essential portion of English society of the Middle Ages has been handled by our ordinary economists, chroniclers, and religionists. . . . It is high time that, without any prejudice in favor of the church,

the nonsense foisted on the public by men interested in suppressing the facts should be exposed. It is not true that the church of our ancestors was the organized fraud which it suits fanatics to represent it. It is not true that the great revenues of the celibate clergy and the celibate recluses were squandered, as a rule, in riotous living. As a mere question of religion, Catholicism was as good as any creed that ever found acceptance among men. Abuses there were, doubtless, and many of them were bitterly attacked by members of the Church themselves; tyranny and persecution there were, too, in many forms. The Church was the one body in which equality of conditions was the rule from the start. There, at least, the man of ability, who, outside her pale, was forced to bow down before some Norman baron whose ruffianly ancestors had formed a part of William's gang of marauders, could rise to a position in which this rough, unlettered swashbuckler groveled before him. Sixtus V was picked up out of the gutter; Nickolas Breakspear, Adrian IV, was a poor laborer's son; and these are but

two instances out of the thousands of distinguished ecclesiastics of humble birth. And the church not only spent half of her money on the poor, but she did still more. A large portion of the money derived by the monks from their land was spent in entertaining strangers, relieving beggars, attending the sick, and in other good works. The abbots and priors were the best landlords in England, and so long as the church held its lands and power, permanent pauperism was unknown. The general employment which they afforded the people, improving the farms, erecting buildings, making roads, in addition to their activity as public almsgivers, teachers, doctors, and nurses, show what useful people many of these much-abused monks and nuns really were."

Every lover of humanity should rejoice in the noble ideals and sacrificial zeal of many Socialists in behalf of a better social order. Schäffle in Germany, writing critically of Socialism, admits that "a spirit of noble endeavor, an idealism which often shames the well-to-do classes, a

devotion approximating martyrdom, characterizes many an agitator of the Social Democracy." The Christian Church cannot afford to relinquish her God-appointed leadership in any movement that concerns the well-being of humanity. Many of the most powerful agencies for social amelioration, for securing human justice, driving out civic corruption, promoting international peace and world-wide brotherhood are working to-day independently of the church which gave them their initial impetus. It is incumbent upon the church not to decrease as they increase and not to be surpassed in vital service to humanity. Her expanding spirit should become so pervasive and her support so substantial that every wise and enduring reform shall visibly embody her life, and she herself be the home of all that is most vital and permanent in modern society.

The Bishop of Hereford, standing in his place among the British Peers in the Parliament, in a recent debate, declared: "If the bishops have any function to perform, it is to speak for the multitu-

dinous poor. . . . Never again shall the fundamental liberties of the people be endangered by a privileged class." If the bishops of every name should exercise such a leadership, what a rallying there would be to their support! That would be a superintendency which would make us Methodists glad indeed. And we ought to be divinely discontented until we get it. Any Methodist bishop might well afford to sacrifice the bird's-eye view gained by traveling through the whole connection, if he became, like Cardinal Manning, a friend of the friendless and a conservator of social order in a single great city.

Lincoln Steffens once asked a ward boss how often he would go to the front for a follower detected in crime. "I'd go once for the kid's sake," was the reply. "Wouldn't you go twice?" "No—well, I might." "Now, wouldn't you go three times?" "O go away! There's got to be some fellow in every ward that any fellow can go to when he needs help, hasn't there?" Boss rule sometimes exercises a determined friendliness that the Chris-

tian Church might well emulate. "Some fellow in every ward that any fellow can go to when he needs help!"—this is what the church should supply in a much better and holier measure than any boss can.

The most conspicuous manifestation of the kingdom of God in our age is this ever-broadening, aggressive force known as democracy. It is changing the ideals and activities of men; it is pulsing with the warmth and vigor of consecrated human lives. This outpouring of the very soul of humanity seeking for the fullest realization and expression is sweeping away principalities and powers, all obstructions, in fact, to equality of opportunity in the broadest sense for every man, woman, and child. This movement is religious and ethical; it is political and economic; but whatever its form or name, it has a definite direction and a predestined goal. Everywhere and always its end is the state, democratically organized to serve the common good.

The church must ally herself with this democratic movement and help direct it,

or fall hopelessly behind. The church needs the large aims and expansive activities in behalf of humanity which such an alliance and ministration would give. Her doctrines of the Divine Fatherhood and Christ's atoning love glow with new meaning and are clothed with tremendous persuasive power whenever men and women are lifted out of the horrible pit and miry clay of the slums and established in respectable, holy living.

We little realize the inexhaustible spiritual wealth before us in this field of our common human nature. When every member of society has the chance to use his God-given powers to the utmost, when there are no weltering masses of abandoned humanity, but all are brought under the discipline of gracious opportunity; when all hungry animalisms are subdued and everything that wastes and desecrates man's precious substance of character is done away, then we shall see Jesus as the Prince of Peace, with "the government upon his shoulder," in the noontide of his glory and fulfilling the aspirations voiced by the Puritan poet:

Come forth out of thy royal chambers,
O Prince of all the kings of the earth,
Put on the visible robes of thy imperial majesty,
Take up that unlimited scepter which thy Almighty Father
Hath bequeathed thee, for now the voice of thy bride
Calls thee and all creatures sigh to be renewed.

Date Due

FACULTY

JUN 15 1994

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

HN64 .D69
The sovereign people,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00025 3643